

Gender Issues in Farm Restructuring in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan:

Implications for the BASIS Research Program

Jeanne Koopman



B A S I S

■ Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems

December 1998

Gender Issues in Farm Restructuring in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan:

Implications for the BASIS Research Program

Jeanne Koopman

Economist and ICRW/BASIS Consultant

Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems

Provided by the BASIS Management Entity

The Land Tenure Center

1357 University Ave.

Madison, WI 53715

Tel: (608) 262-3657

Fax: (608) 262-2141

Email: basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu

<http://www.wisc.edu/ltc/basis.html>

December 1998



This publication was made possible through support provided by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), under the terms of Grant No. LAG-A-00-96-90016-00, and by funding support from the Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Markets (BASIS) project and the BASIS management entity, the Land Tenure Center. All views, interpretations, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the supporting or cooperating organizations.

Copyright © 1998 by Jeanne Koopman. All rights reserved.

Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for noncommercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Produced on behalf of the Consortium for Applied Research on Market Access (CARMA) by the BASIS Management Entity, the Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin–Madison.

CARMA members. Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Wisconsin–Madison; Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID); Institute for Development Anthropology (IDA); Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS), University of Maryland; International Center for Research on Women (ICRW); International Resource Group (IRG); Land Tenure Center (LTC), University of Wisconsin–Madison; Land Tenure Service, Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO); Lincoln Institute of Land Policy; Michigan State University (MSU); Rural Development Institute (RDI); Rural Finance Program, the Ohio State University (OSU); Tuskegee University; Winrock Associates; Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University (IU); World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU).

Host-country institutions collaborating with CARMA. *Central America:* Fundación Dr. Guillermo Manuel Ungo (FUNDAUNGO); Fundación para el Desarrollo Económico (FUNDE); Fundación Salvadoreña para el Desarrollo Económico y Social (FUSADES); Universidad Centro Americana (UCA). *Central Asia:* Cabinet of Ministers of the Uzbek Republic; Ministry of Agriculture and Management (Uzbekistan); Scriabin Agricultural Academy (Kyrgyzstan); Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization Engineers (TIAME); Uzbek Research Institute for Market Reform (URIRM); Uzbek Scientific-Production Center of Agriculture. *Greater Horn of Africa:* African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS); Institute of Development Research (IDR), Addis Ababa University; Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA); Tegemeo Institute of Agricultural Policy and Development of Egerton University. *Southern Africa:* Centre for Applied Social Science, University of Zimbabwe; Centre for Social Research, University of Malawi; Institute of Natural Resources (INR), University of Natal; Núcleo de Estudos da Terra (NET), Eduardo Mondlane University; Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAS), University of Western Cape.

Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| PREFACE | v |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | vii |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1. The BASIS Research Program | 1 |
| 2. Research Planning Workshop and Consultant's Role | 1 |
| 3. Secondary Source Materials on Women in Central Asia | 1 |
| 4. Structure of the Report | 2 |
| II. INDICATORS OF WOMEN'S STATUS: UZBEKISTAN AND THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC | 3 |
| 1. Demography, Health, Education, and Labor Force Participation | 3 |
| 2. Employment and Unemployment | 4 |
| III. PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF ECONOMIC REFORMS | 7 |
| 1. Major Economic Reforms, Real GDP, and Inflation Rates, 1991-1997 | 7 |
| 2. Employment, Wages, Surplus Labor, Migration | 8 |
| 2. Incomes, Standards of Living, and Social Services | 9 |
| 3. Evidence of the Impact of the Economic Reforms on Women | 11 |
| IV. PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF FARM RESTRUCTURING | 13 |
| 1. Access to Land | 13 |
| 2. The Structure of Employment in Uzbekistan's Agricultural Sector | 16 |
| 3. Access to Credit, Inputs, and Markets | 17 |
| V. GENDER ISSUES IN FARM RESTRUCTURING | 21 |
| 1. Women's Work and Women's Wage Employment | 21 |
| 2. Gender Differences in Unemployment Rates (Official and Self-Declared) | 21 |
| 3. Gender Differences in the Impact of Different Models of Farm Restructuring | 22 |
| 4. Gender-specific Effects of Reductions in Social Services and Childcare Facilities | 22 |
| 5. Private Plots and Household Income | 23 |
| 6. Men's and Women's Livestock Rearing Roles and Ownership Rights | 23 |
| 7. Women's Land Rights | 24 |
| 8. Women's Off-farm Employment/Self Employment | 25 |
| 9. Surplus Labor and Gender Differences in Employment Options with Privatization | 25 |
| 10. Labor Times and Gender Roles in the Allocation of Household Income | 26 |
| VI. GENDER ISSUES IN THE FIRST STAGE OF THE RESEARCH | 27 |
| 1. Land | 27 |
| 2. Labor | 27 |
| 3. Water | 28 |
| 4. Mechanization | 28 |
| 5. Finance | 28 |
| 6. Restructuring | 29 |
| VII. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE RESEARCH | 31 |
| 1. Proposed Research Questions to Investigate Gender and Socioeconomic Differences | 31 |
| VIII. GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCE SENSITIVE RESEARCH METHODS | 39 |
| 1. Dealing with Culturally Sensitive Issues | 39 |
| 2. A Proposed Methodological Approach | 39 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 3. Fieldwork: Part One | 40 |
| 4. Fieldwork: Part Two | 41 |
| IX. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PARTICIPATION OF G/WID ASSISTANCE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BASIS RESEARCH | 43 |
| X. INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES FOR SUPPORTING GENDER-SENSITIVE RESEARCH IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC AND UZBEKISTAN | 45 |
| 1. BASIS Coordinators in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan | 45 |
| 2. NGOs Formed by Women Researchers, Activists, and Business Entrepreneurs in Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic | 45 |
| 3. Uzbek Women with BASIS Relevant Skills Working with International NGOs | 47 |
| 4. United Nations Organizations with BASIS-Relevant Resources and Information | 48 |
| 5. Expatriate Scholars doing Research on Uzbek and Kyrgyz Rural Women | 49 |
| REFERENCES | 51 |
| ANNEX: TABLES FOR STAGE I RESEARCH | 53 |
| 1. Land | 53 |
| 2. Labor and Income Data | 53 |
| 3. Water | 54 |
| 4. Mechanization | 54 |
| 5. Finance | 55 |
| 6. Restructuring | 55 |

List of Tables

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Table 1: Indicators of women's status, 1995 | 3 |
| Table 2: Changes in real GDP and inflation rates, 1991-1996 | 7 |
| Table 3: Uzbekistan: Structure of aggregate incomes by social group, 1996 (percentages of total income in different categories of income) | 10 |

PREFACE

Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems (BASIS) is a Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) designed to strengthen both US and host-country research capacity through collaborative research and training programs on land, water, labor, and financial markets and their interactions. The BASIS CRSP operates in Central America, the Horn of Africa, Southern Africa, Central America, Southeast Asia, and Central Asia. It is implemented by the Consortium for Applied Research on Market Access (CARMA), which includes the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), a private, non-profit organization based in Washington, DC. ICRW conducts policy-oriented research and provides technical assistance on women and development issues. It is a member of a consortium of five development organizations that implement Women in Development Technical Assistance (WIDTECH), a global technical assistance and training project funded by the Office of Women in Development (G/WID), Bureau for Global Programs in USAID. ICRW's involvement with BASIS and WIDTECH projects provided the linkage that resulted in this report on gender issues in farm restructuring in Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic.

The BASIS Central Asia program is in the early stages of a collaborative research project on the impact of farm restructuring on land, labor and financial markets. Initial research will take place in the Ferghana Valley, an irrigated, cotton-growing, and culturally homogenous area that is now divided into two independent countries, Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic. The pace and scope of economic reform and farm restructuring have differed considerably in the two countries, making the Ferghana Valley an ideal area in which to examine the impact of differing policies on factor markets and different socioeconomic groups.

This report incorporates the conclusions of researchers, policymakers, and government officials from both the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan who participated in a three day research planning workshop held in Tashkent in January 1998. After outlining the scope and initial impact of the economic reforms that have taken place in each country, the report reviews a variety of gender issues in farm restructuring and suggests how the research program can identify and analyze the differing effects of policies on different social groups: men and women, young and old, rich and poor.

The report draws heavily on the contributions of participants in the January 1998 workshop. Individuals from international NGOs, United Nations agencies and local NGOs of women researchers, activists, and entrepreneurs also contributed important insights. The author is particularly grateful to the BASIS coordinators in Uzbekistan, Alim Pulatov of the Tashkent Institute of Engineers of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization, and in the Kyrgyz Republic, Klara Ismailova of the Kyrgyz Agrarian Academy, and to Inobat Avezmuratova of Winrock International/Uzbekistan, Marfua Tokhtakhodjaeva of the Women's Resource Center in Tashkent, and Dildora Alimbekova and Makhmudova Gulnora of the Business Women's Association of Uzbekistan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Economic policies to privatize agriculture and industry have been implemented much more rapidly in the Kyrgyz Republic than in Uzbekistan. Privatization is nearly complete in Kyrgyzstan's agricultural sector, but it is moving very slowly in Uzbekistan. Both countries have serious problems of surplus labor in the rural sector, particularly in the Ferghana valley. Although only the Kyrgyz Republic reports relatively high levels of overt unemployment, *both* countries have suffered increasing poverty as wage levels and social services have declined.

In Uzbekistan farm restructuring has proceeded very cautiously, primarily through the renaming of state farms and through experimentation with short-term leases for members of collective farms. Little has changed in the organization of work and decision-making. Outside their 0.1 hectare private plot, farm workers have no independent access to land, credit, or markets. The few private farms existing today have been created mainly by selling off the livestock units or fruit orchards of collective farms. Collective farm managers or specialists (like economists and agronomists) have been the primary purchasers. Even these new "private farmers," however, have little power to decide on crops or markets, since the state still firmly controls both input and product markets.

The Kyrgyz Republic has recently broken up its large collective farms, but not necessarily into single family farms. Many new farm enterprises are multiple family farms, managed by an elected manager.

Access to credit from banks or savings and credit societies is practically non-existent in Uzbekistan, but informal "sponsors" sometimes provide large loans to certain privileged private farmers. In the Kyrgyz Republic lack of adequate access to credit for agricultural investment is also a serious problem.

Women are acknowledged to have been affected more severely than men by the economic troubles, especially in declining earnings, loss of family allowances and day care, and declining access to higher education. In both the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan, women accounted for about half the labor force prior to independence (1991), but during the recent economic crises they have been losing jobs more rapidly than men. Unemployment has cut women off from housing and family benefits, increasing their vulnerability to domestic violence, which reportedly has been increasing.

Current statistics do not reveal how farm restructuring has changed the balance between men's and women's paid and unpaid work, their respective abilities to make economic decisions, and their access to economic resources. This needs to be studied.

Sections two through five of the report review the gender aspects of the macroeconomic reforms and farm restructuring:

- the changing formal sector employment and unemployment rates,
- women's and men's coping strategies as their formal employment declines,
- the reduction in social services and childcare facilities resulting from the reforms,
- the increasing importance of private plots with the decline in real wages,

- the need to study gender patterns in access to and control over the output of private plots,
- changes in livestock rearing and ownership rights,
- the precarious situation of women who give up waged jobs to help their husbands farm,
- gender and age aspects of off-farm employment and self employment in the informal sector,
- changes in men's and women's overall labor times,
- changes in the allocation of household income.

Because people's economic options as individuals are critical to their own and their families' welfare, BASIS research needs to systematically differentiate between men and women in different socioeconomic situations when studying the impact of changes in economic policies. It must study how different groups are coping with job losses and reacting to new opportunities, including those in the nascent informal sector. The results of this type of research can assist governments in identifying policies to enhance economic opportunities for a wide variety of groups, including women and youth.

Section six discusses the gender aspects of the statistical data collection and reviews of legal issues conducted during the first stage of the research (February-March 1998). Section seven proposes research questions for the fieldwork. These questions are grouped under the following topics: land and water, labor and incomes, finance, and farm restructuring, mechanization and labor use. They elaborate the research questions identified by the participants in the January 1998 workshop, concentrating on the gender and socioeconomic difference aspects discussed earlier in the report.

Section eight treats methodological issues related to the cultural sensitivity of gender and socioeconomic differences. It proposes that in the early stages of the research, rapid and participatory rural appraisal methods be used to identify and analyze sensitive issues with gender and age-specific focus groups made up of participants of similar socioeconomic situations. Rapid, participatory methods can be expected to improve the relevance of the research to local communities and provide policy relevant information. For many issues, however, findings from rapid appraisal methods will need to be supplemented with formal statistical surveys to study the frequency distribution and corollary factors associated with the initial findings.

Section nine recommends that the BASIS research project in Central Asia consider the assistance of Central Asian and other experts in gender and socioeconomic difference analysis for the following aspects of the research program: (1) design of the fieldwork, (2) training the research teams in gender and socioeconomic difference-sensitive rapid rural appraisal methods, and (3) planning the research questionnaires and sample surveys.

Section ten provides references to Uzbek and Kyrgyz institutions and individual researchers who could provide this type of assistance and lists expatriate scholars who have conducted research on rural women in Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. THE BASIS RESEARCH PROGRAM

The BASIS program in Central Asia is initiating a research project on land, labor, and financial markets. The first phase of the research will focus on the effects of farm restructuring in the Ferghana Valley, an irrigated, cotton-growing agricultural area governed since 1991 by three different countries: Uzbekistan, the Kyrgyz Republic, and Tajikistan. Because the Ferghana Valley had essentially the same cultural and agrarian history in the pre-independence Soviet period, it offers a unique opportunity to study the impact of differing post-independence reform policies. Initially the research will be undertaken in Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic, where policies of economic reform and farm restructuring provide a particularly striking contrast. The Kyrgyz republic has privatized state and collective farms and significantly reduced centralized economic management, while the government of Uzbekistan has, in practice, changed the former centralized system very little.

2. RESEARCH PLANNING WORKSHOP AND CONSULTANT'S ROLE

The Land Tenure Center at the University of Wisconsin, the lead institution in the BASIS CRSP, requested its BASIS partner, ICRW, to provide a consultant to participate in a January 1998 collaborative research planning workshop in Tashkent and to offer ideas for the integration of gender issues into the research design. The workshop had some 40 participants from Uzbekistan, the Kyrgyz Republic and other Central Asian countries, NGOs, US university and research organizations.¹

The consultancy took place in Tashkent from 17 January-6 February 1998. The first week was spent planning the workshop, visiting two farms near Tashkent (one collective and one private), and meeting with representatives of government, NGO and international institutions. The workshop took place during the second week, and post-workshop meetings with six research groups to prepare a short-term research workplan for the February to April 1998 period were held during the third week. This report, which outlines the policy relevant gender issues and proposes methodologies for studying them, was written after the consultant returned to the United States. An earlier version was translated into Russian and distributed to Uzbek and Kyrgyz research participants.

3. SECONDARY SOURCE MATERIALS ON WOMEN IN CENTRAL ASIA

A review of secondary source materials on women in Central Asia was conducted using the resources of the Tashkent offices of the United Nations Development Program, UNICEF, World

¹ See the BASIS report, *Synthesis of the January 1998 Central Asia Regional Planning Workshop*, Land Tenure Center, Madison, Wisconsin.

Bank, and the Women's Resource Center, an independent Uzbek NGO, as well as those of the Harvard Library System in Cambridge, Massachusetts. As far as could be determined from this relatively brief search, there are no published studies in English on rural women in Uzbekistan, although three doctoral dissertations are currently being written and three other field studies are at planning stages. For the Kyrgyz Republic, I found only a brief summary of one study that interviewed 700 women about their changing employment situation. There is also least one US doctoral dissertation being written on Kyrgyz rural women.²

Given the dearth of available studies, information has been gleaned from several sources to piece together an initial analysis of the impact of farm restructuring and post-independence reform policies on rural women.³ The picture is unavoidably sketchy, but it is complete enough to identify critical issues that need to be studied. These are signaled in the body of the report in short, italicized paragraphs on "implications for the BASIS research" and are also summarized in a separate section on research proposals.

4. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The report begins with a review of indicators of women's status and an overview of recent macroeconomic reforms. Section four describes the process of farm restructuring, and section five analyzes the implications for women. Sections six and seven make suggestions for the overall research design, focusing first on general issues, then presenting a list of research questions that can help clarify the impact of farm restructuring on men and women from different socioeconomic strata. Section eight sets out methodological proposals for including gender issues in the research, section nine suggests how experts from ICRW might be involved in the research, and section ten lists institutions, researchers and gender experts from Central Asia, the United States and Europe who can assist in making the research more gender sensitive.

² For references to this work in progress, see section 10 below.

³ Among the more important sources used are the Eckert and Elwert 1996 study on land tenure in Uzbekistan, the 1997 Chemonics project report on farm restructuring, the 1993 World Bank country report on Uzbekistan, three UNDP Human Development Reports for Uzbekistan, some very brief UNICEF reports, and a one hour interview with two women from a "model" collective farm near Tashkent.

II. INDICATORS OF WOMEN'S STATUS: UZBEKISTAN AND THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

1. DEMOGRAPHY, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION

Table 1: Indicators of women's status, 1995

| | Uzbekistan | Kyrgyz Republic |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Population | 23 million (1995) | 4.7 million (1995) |
| Per capita income | \$930 (1995) | \$1,160 (1994) |
| Percent population rural | 62% | 61% |
| Average rural family size | 6.1 | |
| Total fertility rate | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| Infant mortality rate | 37.7 per 1000 live births | |
| Life expectancy: women | 72 | 73 |
| Life expectancy: men | 65 | 64 |
| Literacy: women over 15 | 100% | 96% |
| Literacy: men over 15 | 100% | 99% |
| Human Development Index World Ranking | 94 | 89 |
| Religion | 88% Muslim 9% Eastern Orthodox | 70% Muslim 28% Eastern Orthodox |
| Women as % of labor force | 46% (1993) 43% (1996) | 51% (1993) |
| Women as % of unemployed | 66% (1996) | 60% (1995) |
| Women as % of top managers | | 17.5% |

Sources: Uzbekistan, 1996, p. 30; Herman et al. 1996, p. 10 for Kyrgyzstan; p. 17 for Uzbekistan; World Bank, 1993, p. 98. UNICEF, 1994, p. 134, for women's share of employment in Kyrgyzstan; UNDP 1997, p. 91, for women's share in employment and unemployed in Uzbekistan; Herman et al for women's share of official unemployment in Kyrgyzstan.

Women's high literacy and labor force participation rates are the direct results of 70 years of Soviet education, employment, and childcare policies. These policies have had an important impact on how women view themselves as economic and social actors. According to a sociologist who conducted field research in the Uzbek language, most women now want higher education for their daughters and paid employment for themselves (personal communication, Elizabeth Constantine, Central Asian Program, University of Iowa).

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

The data available for Kyrgyzstan reflects dramatic changes in the availability of preschool education and after-school programs that provided childcare services for working mothers. Between 1990 and 1995, the number of preschools declined by 73 percent, from 1,696 to 456. After-school programs were all but eliminated, falling from 1,225 to 12. These changes followed the introduction of fees. The impact of this drastic change in the availability of childcare services can be expected to affect women in several ways: a reduction in women's employment as teachers and childcare workers, a reduction in the employment rate of women with preschool-aged children and possibly of those with school-aged children as well.

***Implication for BASIS research:** Data should be collected on changes in the availability of day care and after-school programs in Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic as a whole and in the research areas of the Ferghana Valley. The research should investigate the effects of farm restructuring on childcare as well as the impact of the reduced availability of affordable childcare on women's employment.*

UZBEKISTAN

In 1994, nearly half of all students in primary and secondary schools were female, but women accounted for only 39 percent of those enrolled in higher education establishments. Women's enrollment in universities has declined significantly since the 1980s when they represented 47-51 percent of graduates. In 1994 only 25 percent post-graduate students and 12 percent of Ph.D. candidates were women (UNDP 1995). Gender discrimination in higher education is worsening. In 1995, an elite private university in Tashkent adopted a policy to stop accepting women in the fields of international relations and international law (Herman et al. 1996, p. 20).

***Implication for BASIS research:** Since women's (and men's) access to secondary, higher and graduate education will affect the gender composition of employment and income structures, gender-differentiated data on enrollment and graduation rates at all educational levels should be collected for Uzbekistan and for the Kyrgyz Republic, both nationally and for the regions to be studied in the Ferghana Valley. Men's and women's assessment of the economic impact of the decline in women's access to higher education should be investigated.*

2. EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Women's participation rates in the paid labor force have been very high by international standards, especially in the Soviet period. Two years after independence, women still represented 51 percent of the employed population in Kyrgyzstan (UNICEF 1994, p. 134) but were already suffering from an acceleration of job losses.

A recent study of more than 600 Kyrgyz women found that even though 83 percent of all women had been in paid employment in 1989, by 1993, 77 percent of the women interviewed were unemployed, most having been laid off from the jobs in the previous year (Kuehnast 1993, cited in UNICEF 1994, pp. 131-2). Over half had not applied for unemployment benefits and therefore did not appear in the official unemployment statistics.

Women's employment situation has continued to deteriorate. A 1996 government report (Kyrgyz Republic qtd. in Herman et al. 1996, p. 14) states that:

Resulting from the liquidation of work places, the number of unemployed women is growing. Of the officially registered unemployed people, about 60 percent are women. Particularly critical is the deficit of work places in the regions, where substantial release is primarily caused by reformation of the *kolkhoz* [the former collective farms] and closing of social-cultural institutions [such as the preschool and after-school programs mentioned above].

UZBEKISTAN

Women's participation in the labor force in Uzbekistan has also been very high in the past, but has also been falling recently. Women were 47 percent of the labor force in 1992 and 43 percent in 1996 (UNDP 1997, p. 91). This decline in women's share is consistent with widespread anecdotal evidence that women have been losing their jobs in larger numbers than men.

III. PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF ECONOMIC REFORMS

1. MAJOR ECONOMIC REFORMS, REAL GDP, AND INFLATION RATES, 1991-1997

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

The Kyrgyz government launched its economic privatization program soon after independence in 1991. By 1995, about half the former state and collective farms had been broken up and transformed into single family or (more commonly) multiple family private farms (Bloch, Delehanty, and Roth 1996). A national currency was introduced in 1993. Until at least 1995, however, the economy reacted very poorly to the reforms. (See table 2.)

UZBEKISTAN

Even though Uzbekistan also introduced its own currency in 1993, the government has taken a much slower path toward economic reform. In fact, many of the privatization policies were more cosmetic than real. This is especially true in the agricultural sector where the transformation of state farms into cooperatives and the minor changes undertaken in collective farm organization have had little impact on their highly centralized, state-controlled management structures. By 1995, real private farms (called *dekhkan* farms) accounted for only 6 percent of all arable land. (Uzbekistan 1996, pp. 40-41). (Farm restructuring is discussed in more detail in section four below.)

Table 2: Changes in real GDP and inflation rates, 1991-1996

| | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 |
|----------------------------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Real GDP (% change) | | | | | | |
| Kyrgyz Republic | | -12% | -15% | -20% | -6% | |
| Uzbekistan | -0.5% | -11% | -2.4% | -5.2% | -0.9% | 1.6% |
| Inflation rate | | | | | | |
| Kyrgyz Republic | 150% | 900% | 1250% | 450% | 250% | |
| Uzbekistan | 106% | 719% | 1042% | 1457% | 250% | 85% |

Sources: Gross Domestic Product: *Kyrgyz Republic*: UNICEF 1997, p. 7, quoted from UN ECE 1996; *Uzbekistan 1993-96*: UNDP 1997, p. 96. Inflation *Kyrgyz Republic*: UNICEF 1997, p. 7 (figures are taken from a graph; the 1995 figure is an estimate); *Uzbekistan*: UNDP 1997, p. 34.

As the data illustrates, Uzbekistan has not suffered the drastic decline in real GDP experienced in the Kyrgyz Republic (or in other countries of the former Soviet Union). The Uzbek government attributes this to the moderate pace with which it has pursued free market reforms. Be that as it may, Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic have both suffered hyperinflation which has only recently been brought under some degree of control.

2. EMPLOYMENT, WAGES, SURPLUS LABOR, MIGRATION

UZBEKISTAN

Although Uzbekistan's 1991-1995 decline in real GDP was not accompanied by a serious increase in open unemployment (UNDP 1997, p. 53), from 1990 to 1993 real wages fell by 70 percent (World Bank 1993, p. 99). There was also a serious problem of underemployment or too many workers with too little to do. In 1993, the World Bank predicted that privatization would reduce underemployment and bring about a sharp increase in unemployment. Job loss, however, was expected to be "cushioned" by women's "voluntary withdrawal" into the household (see more on this problematic assumption below).

Massive unemployment has *not* occurred in Uzbekistan, mainly because the state is reluctant to induce it by privatizing state controlled enterprises. In 1995, the official unemployment rate was less than one percent (Uzbekistan 1995, p. 32). Even though this does not give a accurate picture of actual unemployment (because the official rate is calculated only from the number of people who register as unemployed), most sources agree that underemployment, not open unemployment, is currently the most serious problem. Underemployment is especially prevalent in rural areas, above all in the densely populated Ferghana Valley. The cotton sector alone is estimated to have nearly half a million excess workers (UNDP 1996, p. 41).

We have little information on the related topic of migration. The UNHCR's 1997 migration study mainly traced the nationality of external immigrants and emigrants (including the regions of origin and destination). There is no breakdown by gender. On rural/urban migration patterns UNHCR offers only the following: total net migration during 1989-1996 shows a net loss in urban areas of 143,676 persons, and a net inflow into rural areas of 187,200 persons. When broken down into inter-province and intra-province, net migration repeats the same pattern, with three quarters of the change accounted for by intra-province shifts from urban to rural areas (UNHCR 1997, p. 27). This data confirms anecdotal data that people are returning to farms upon losing urban jobs. Nonetheless, the net change is relatively small for a population of over 13 million.

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Except for evidence of potentially serious female unemployment from a 1993 survey of 600 women (in which 73 percent of those interviewed reported themselves as unemployed), I have no information on overall unemployment or trends in wages. Given the extremely high rates of inflation of the early 1990s, however, real wages are likely to have fallen significantly.

As in Uzbekistan, there is evidence of underemployment in the rural sector. A 1995 survey of the heads of rural committees indicated that prior to restructuring, state and collective farm enterprises had problems with excess labor. Nearly half of the heads of rural committees (many

of whom had been directors of state and collective farms) said that their work forces exceeded the actual needs for laborers (Roth, et al. 1996, p. 88)⁴.

Implication for BASIS research: *It will be important to investigate the employment, unemployment, and the emigration/immigration situation by both sex and age and to try to understand the underlying factors contributing to age, sex, socioeconomic and occupational differences in the distribution of the labor force between the formal and informal sectors. We also need to ask: What are workers who are underemployed in the formal sector doing to contribute to family income and consumption from outside the formal sector? This requires serious attention to the informal sector, attention which apparently, thus far, has not been forthcoming from either government or academic research institutions. The BASIS research needs to study all activities of people who have been affected by farm restructuring and loss of jobs in the formal sector—migration, informal sector activities, changes in self-provisioning on private plots, and so forth.*

2. INCOMES, STANDARDS OF LIVING, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Despite progress in 1994 and 1995 in achieving macroeconomic stability, the standard of living in the Kyrgyz Republic is reported to have fallen dramatically (Herman, et al. 1996, p. 11). Elimination of subsidies from Moscow for daycare, after-school programs, and pensions has had an especially heavy impact on women.

UZBEKISTAN

Despite the fact that the incidence of poverty was already high in Uzbekistan before independence, the situation worsened considerably in the 1990s. In 1989, 44 percent of the population (including nearly all collective farmers) lived below a poverty line defined as the income required to purchase a minimum needs consumption basket (World Bank 1993, p. 98). By 1991 as much as three quarters of the population had slipped below the poverty line (UNDP 1997, p. 45). Over the next five years this poverty deepened drastically: by 1994 real disposable income was less than half its 1991 level (UNDP 1997, pp. 47-49).

Recent field research indicates that the severe poverty of the post-independence period has prevented many rural families from building houses for their newly married sons. This has serious implications for a young family's access to land; if the family cannot build a house, the newlyweds are not granted the separate household plot a young man normally receives at marriage (Eckert and Elwert 1996, pp. 30-1). Failure to obtain a private plot for adult children reduces the extended family's resources.

Implications for Basis Research: *If a married son lives with his parents and unmarried siblings in one house, the extended family is considered seriously impoverished. This phenomenon can be used as a means of rapidly identifying the poorest families in the research area.*

⁴ The survey was conducted among 47 rural committee heads in all six of Kyrgyzstan's provinces (*oblast*).

The structure of aggregate incomes in Uzbekistan changed significantly during the first five years of independence, 1991-1995: the share of wages declined from 57 percent of aggregate incomes to 44 percent and the share of monetary and in-kind transfers from the state declined from 25 percent of aggregate income to 17 percent (UNDP 1997, pp. 46-7). These trends accelerated in 1996 (see table 3 below).

In response to falling wages and state transfers, people began producing food to sell in their private plots or in urban mini-gardens and also started up a wide variety of micro-businesses. These coping strategies show up in the aggregate economic statistics. For example, the sale of food from private gardens accounted for less than 10 percent of household monetary income in 1991, but more than 19 percent in 1995 (UNDP 1997). Individual entrepreneurial activities provided only 2 percent of household monetary income in 1993, but this jumped to 13 percent in 1995.

The following table, which uses data only from 1996, illustrates the effect of the post-independent changes on the structure of aggregate incomes of different population groups. (Note that columns 2-3 break down aggregate income into monetary and in-kind income, while columns 4-8 break down total money income into different categories.)

Table 3: Uzbekistan: Structure of aggregate incomes by social group, 1996 (percentages of total income in different categories of income)

| | Aggregate income | In-kind income from private plots | Total money income | Money income from private plots | Wages | Enterprise income | Transfers | Other income |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Total | 100 | 8 | 92 | 18 | 28 | 25 | 12 | 9 |
| Industrial workers | 100 | 5 | 95 | 5 | 58 | 4 | 14 | 14 |
| Collective farm workers | 100 | 19 | 81 | 27 | 27 | 1 | 17 | 9 |
| Entrepreneurs | 100 | 6 | 94 | 26 | 10 | 45 | 6 | 7 |

Source: Adapted from UNDP 1977:57 (original source not cited by UNDP⁵).

Among the more striking aspects of table 3 is the great importance of private plots to household income. This is true not only for collective farm household, where private plots provide nearly half of household income (19 percent in the form of food grown for family consumption and 27 percent from food sales), it is also true for households headed by an entrepreneur, where private plots provide a third of household income.

⁵ The study from which the data have been drawn is not indicated in the UNDP report. *BASIS research should seek access to the original study and consider conducting a similar study in the Ferghana valley.*

The increasing share of household income coming from private plots and micro-enterprises may be due to a change in women's economic activity. Employment data indicate that in the 1990s only one adult in collective farm households was employed full time on the farm (World Bank 1993, p. 286). Given the sex breakdown of "farmers" on the two collective farms the BASIS mission visited, it is probable that that person was a man and that it is women in farm households who are currently allocating their labor to private plots. This issue needs investigation.

Implication for BASIS research: *The data on the increasing contribution of private plots to aggregate household income may indicate that an informal private sector is developing based in part on women's production from private plots. With job loss in the formal sector skewed against women, female unemployment may be pushing women into the informal sector at a faster rate than men.*

Gender, age and socioeconomic characteristics of entrants into the informal sector need to be investigated at field level, as does the form and level of informal sector remuneration for groups with different characteristics. The scope and impact of changes in labor allocation over the course of the reforms should be investigated by tracing changes in household labor allocation between formal and informal sectors and between monetary and in-kind income generation.

3. EVIDENCE OF THE IMPACT OF THE ECONOMIC REFORMS ON WOMEN

In 1996, the government of the Kyrgyz Republic issued a report on women stating that 70 percent of women surveyed that year felt that "the consequences of the economic transformation" have made women's situation worse (Kyrgyz Republic 1996, cited in UNDP 1997). Despite considerable evidence to support this conclusion for both the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan, the causes of the disproportionately negative impact of privatization on women have not been identified or addressed either by governments or by the major donors who influence policy. This lack of analysis is dangerous for women's welfare since it fosters an environment in which naïve assumptions and sex discrimination can easily prevail. A World Bank Study on Uzbekistan, for example, has suggested that the dual problems underemployment and unemployment could be eased if women would "voluntarily" withdraw from the labor force.

Labor-force participation among women is high by international standards. Some women may voluntarily retreat into the domestic sphere; others may opt for part-time employment. This will ease the problem of job creation. (World Bank 1993, p. 100)

I would argue that it is dangerous to assume that women's unemployment or "voluntary" withdrawal from the labor force is unlikely to have serious negative consequences, both for families and for women. Women themselves are making the same argument. As a case in point, a study in the Kyrgyz Republic (Kuehnast 1993, cited in UNICEF 1994) found that although 83 percent of adult women had been in the labor force at independence, two years later over three quarters of the 600 women interviewed were unemployed, most having lost their jobs in the previous year. Only a few had "voluntarily" left the labor force for reasons such as pregnancy or illness. Nearly all of the women reported that they were highly distressed to have lost their jobs. When women lost their jobs they also lost access to job-related family benefits, child-care support, housing and in-kind contributions of food and fuel. Some women even suggested that the physical and psychological isolation of unemployment was leading to an increasing incidence of female alcoholism (UNICEF 1994, p. 132).

Reports on the human rights situations in the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan also suggest that rising unemployment is associated with increasing rates of alcoholism, rape and domestic violence (US State Department 1997a, 1997b; Herman et al. 1996, p. 15). Currently there are no shelters for abused women or programs to combat problems of domestic violence.

In these conditions, female-biased job loss and anti-women discrimination in hiring has the potential to lock a significant segment of the female population into situations of poverty and/or abuse, even though the women who are losing their jobs have relatively high levels of education and work experience as well as considerable motivation to engage in paid work.

There is increasing evidence that privatization has been very problematic for rural as well as urban women. Kyrgyz women from semi-nomadic societies interviewed in 1992-93 pointed out that work in pastoral societies has always been based on collective principles and organization. Soviet collectivization was therefore, to a certain degree, a compatible way of life. These women reported that they had worked hard for the collective farm, and, in return, many of their daily concerns (childcare, education, health) had been taken care of. They said that they did not understand why everyone does not have a job under the new system, and they expressed a strong preference for a collective model over one in which only a few can find work. Many reported that their households were suffering increasing shortages of clothing, medicine, fuel and even food (Kuehnast 1993, cited in UNICEF 1994, p. 132). Kuehnast's study concluded that the new economic and social policies have made both nomadic women and women on privatized rural farms far more vulnerable to poverty. And poverty, as we have seen, has worsened significantly in the 1990s.

Implication for BASIS research: *The research on the effects of farm restructuring in the Ferghana Valley should assess the impact of increasing female unemployment on women's and household incomes and on women's and children's welfare (access to subsidies, day care and other services). The research should also assess the effects of farm restructuring on marketed and non-marketed production and on the monetary and in-kind income of households in which women have become unemployed since the advent of the reforms.*

Because increasing unemployment may also be leading to increasing family dissolution as the incidence of domestic violence and alcoholism rises (see US 1997a and b), the fieldwork needs to investigate these issues. Men and women should be interviewed in separate focus groups. These interviews should also investigate if and how rural women retain access to resources and income in the event of abandonment or divorce.

Data on female headed households should be collected both to trace changes in the incidence of female headship and to assess its effects on household incomes and individual welfare. Care must be taken to investigate the situation of women who are required to provide for their children without a husband's or other male relative's support but who are not considered to "head" their households in a juridical sense.

Focus group discussions can be used to identify income, output, and welfare indicators for various types of households. The results of these discussions should be compared with data on income and welfare from standard surveys. Issues like domestic violence need to be raised in the context of attempts to identify the policy implications for dealing with both women's and men's unemployment.

IV. PROGRESS AND IMPACT OF FARM RESTRUCTURING

1. ACCESS TO LAND

UZBEKISTAN

In 1991, of the 3.5 million persons employed in Uzbekistan's agricultural sector, about 60 percent were employees of collective or state farms and 39 percent were temporary farm workers who also worked on household private plots. The latter probably were mainly women. Less than 0.2 percent of the employed rural population worked on private (*dekhkan*) farms (World Bank 1993, p. 286).

The average state or collective farm covered 2000 hectares (4400 acres) and housed a population of 6000 or more people. Most of the restructuring of these huge state controlled entities has been cosmetic, reflecting the Uzbek government's hesitancy to privatize the agricultural sector. In 1996 the most important types of farms were still collectives of different types (accounting for 72 percent of all arable land) and household plots on collectives (12 percent of arable land) (Chemonics 1997, p. 4). Although nearly all state farms were formally reorganized into cooperatives or joint stock enterprises in 1994-95, these changes had little effect on the organization of production, marketing, or even employment (Mearns 1996, pp. 16, 20). Workers still earned wages and followed the orders of the former brigade leaders.⁶

From 1991 to 1995, the number of private (*dekhkan*) farms increased from 1,900 to 18,100, but they still only accounted for only 6 percent of total arable land (Uzbekistan 1996, p. 41). *Dekhkan* farms are indeed private, but they are rarely, if ever, "family farms." Most are specialty farms, such as dairy farms, orchards, or vineyards, that have been split off from a collective farm, which itself remains intact (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 21, and mission interviews, January 1998). Most *dekhkan* farms were formed when the assets of the former collective farm brigade (a work and land unit uniting 20-40 households) were "purchased" by a private farmer who then hired (or fired) as many of the former brigade members as he wished. (The "he" is used deliberately as it is doubtful that a significant share of private farmers are women—see below.)

To purchase a private farm, applicants had to meet certain qualifications. For example, they had to be able to "work well" as determined by the district head (*hokhim*), making personal acquaintance with the district head a factor in getting one's application approved. Another criterion was the number of *sons* an applicant had. District heads and private farmers interviewed by Eckert suggested that "farmers without sons could not obtain private farms, even if they came from successful farming families" (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 22). As Eckert noted, this is somewhat surprising since over 50 percent of agricultural workers were women (information Eckert obtained from the vice minister of labor in 1993), and because rural women did most of

⁶ Real wages, however, had declined precipitously from 1991 to 1995.

the work on the family plots around the houses and were less likely than men to have a job outside the *kolkhoz*.

While all this suggests that women are unlikely to figure prominently among farm owners, I found no systematic information on the gender of private farmers. Among the private farmers who have been involved with Winrock International's Farmer-to-Farmer program, some 10-15 percent are said to be women (Herman et al. 1996, p. 21).

Most districts also had a rule that to be eligible to purchase a private farm, the applicant had to be a full time professional farmer, spending his time entirely on the land. This rule, however, has apparently not been followed. Eckert (1996, p. 22) found many cases in which members of the administration were the first (and sometimes the only) persons to establish a private farm. Lestina and Voytan (1996, pp. 1-2) found that many of the new private "farmers" came from fields like accounting, teaching, transportation. Another large group of private farmers are former economists, managers or other specialists from the collective farm itself. These are the people with enough connections to mobilize a number of "sponsors" to loan them money to make downpayments on the assets of a former state or collective farm. (Formal credit is largely unavailable, even to the well connected—see below.)

The practical criteria for farm ownership was succinctly summed up by a group of women interviewed by Eckert:

In order to found a *dekhkan* you first need good connections. Second, you need money for bribing your good connections. Third, you need money for machines and taxes. Fourth, you need money for training. And last you need money for labourers. Only then you can start and make some money with your farm. (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 38)

Even if you have all this, owning a private farm does not necessarily give you much latitude in decision-making. With tight state control over input supply and produce outlets, private farmers in Uzbekistan only have the power to decide on their crop mixes and markets in theory, not in practice. This is a major difference from the situation in the Kyrgyz Republic.

Lack of decision-making power by those who work the land is even more restricted in other forms of "privatization." For example, when collective farms (*kolkhoz*) were transformed into leasehold (*shirkat*) farms, they were officially considered to be part of the private sector. A *shirkat* farm was formed when a *kolkhoz* was divided into its former production units (grain, cotton, vegetables, livestock) (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 25). These "private" *shirkat* farms are still very large (with thousands of workers), and production is still organized by the same brigade leaders who led the production units of the *kolkhoz*. The individual leaseholder or "tenant" does not participate in production or marketing decisions, and other members of his family, including the women who had formerly earned an individual wage on the *kolkhoz*, have no guaranteed income. The individual tenant's income depends on profits at the old brigade level. This profit is not always forthcoming, however, since leasehold contracts, which are concluded between the state and the *shirkat* farm as a whole (the former brigade) sometimes leave no surplus to the tenant (ibid., p. 28).

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

In January 1995, single-family "private" farms and multi-family "peasant" farms accounted for 12 percent of arable land in the Kyrgyz Republic, as compared to 6 percent for private (*dekhkan*) farms in Uzbekistan. Associations of peasant farms (which initially were essentially renamed

state or collective farms) in the Kyrgyz Republic also controlled 12 percent of the arable land, while cooperatives had 11 percent, collective farms 25 percent, and state farms 23 percent. State agricultural research institutes and other state agricultural enterprises controlled 17 percent (Delehanty and Rasmussen 1996, pp. 46, 56).

While this implies an agrarian institutional structure quite similar to that currently existing in Uzbekistan, since 1995 this situation has apparently changed radically. In the past 2-3 years, the Kyrgyz government has broken up nearly all state and collective farms into single or multiple family private farms (personal communication, K. Kadirkulov, General Director of the Republican Center of Land and Agrarian Reforms of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, January 1998).

The Kyrgyz process of farm restructuring started out much like that described for Uzbekistan. The first private farms were merely former brigade-level land units that were split off from the state and collective farms. The rural and government elite—former managers, specialists or administrators of the state or collective farm who had both the money and the connections necessary to operate individually in a collective economy—formed the large majority of the early private farmers. This first wave of private farmers had a significant advantage over those who followed because they had been able to purchase farm machinery, spare parts, feed, farm chemicals, seeds, and so forth from the state at wholesale prices (Roth et al. 1996, p. 95).

This model changed when a February 1994 decree limited the size of individual land shares. Between 1994 and about 1996, when a collective or state farm of some 2000 or more hectares was privatized, it was transformed into one of three basic farm types: (1) it was split into about 110 private single family farms, (2) it was divided into some 40 multiple family peasant farms (see below), (3) it was reorganized into two or three peasant associations or cooperatives (Roth, et al. 1996, pp. 90, 94). In this process, most of the former employees received land. Those who could not afford to farm as a single family, or who needed to farm larger parcels in order to make use of mechanized equipment from the former collective farm, pooled their land into multiple family peasant farms (the most common model) or formed cooperatives.

Roth, et al. suggest that in the Kyrgyz Republic “the reforms appear[ed] relatively egalitarian, both in terms of land allocations to various classes of workers and in terms of gender.... Management and administrative staff, farm production workers, pensioners, service workers, and children all received between 0.66 and 0.73 hectare per person. Only residents working off the farm received significantly smaller land shares.... The vast majority of rural committees allocated identically-sized land shares to both men and women” (ibid. p. 97).

A research team from the University of Wisconsin’s Land Tenure Center conducted interviews in 1995 in the Osh and Djalal-Abad Regions in the Ferghana Valley with the heads of 40 farm enterprises. Of these, 75 percent were peasant farms (multiple-family enterprises), 7 percent were single-family private farms, and 18 percent were cooperatives.⁷ The average number of households in a farm enterprise in the Ferghana Valley was 59, far higher than the country average of 31. The average size of the enterprises surveyed was 62 hectares. The average amount of arable land per enterprise was 57 hectares; 35 hectares were irrigated. The mean number of

⁷ The mean size of cooperatives is about 445 hectares in that area, whereas the mean size of peasant and private farms (together) is 26-27 hectares (Delehanty and Rasmussen 1996, p. 57).

people living on an enterprise was 391, 102 of whom were working age adults (Roth, et al. 1996, pp. 103-4).

All the farm enterprise heads were male, with a technical school, university, or graduate degree. (ibid., pp.104-5). Enterprise heads had the legal responsibility to organize production and marketing. They decided which crops were grown, how farm labor was allocated and where and on what terms produce was marketed. Roth, et al (1996) also found that the enterprise head had acquired de facto power to authorize land transfers and to set his/her terms. This power was as vast as that of former farm managers, but could presumably be curbed by democratic processes, since most enterprises elected their heads.

Interviews with enterprise heads in the Ferghana Valley regions of Kyrgyzstan indicated that privatization has done little to alleviate the surplus labor problem. In Osh and Djala-Abad *oblasts*, 36 percent of enterprise heads indicated that the number of workers for the land available was “very excessive,” another 18 percent considered it “slightly excessive,” 41 percent said it was “about right,” and 5 percent indicated a “slight shortage” (ibid., p. 108).

Implication for BASIS research: *In both countries, access to land and commodity markets on a private basis has been associated with access to political power. The BASIS research needs to pay attention to the gender aspects of the links between access to political leadership and decision making, on the one hand, and access to economic resources and economic decision making, on the other.*

We also need to know more about individual and household ability to make production and marketing decisions under different types of farm enterprise and about the processes used to make decisions in multi-household farms of different types.

Finally, the research should study what happens to access to land and other economic resources in cases of divorce or other forms of household dissolution. To what extent can men or women whose households break up sell, rent, or exchange their land shares? More research needs to be conducted in separate focus groups (by sex and age groups) to determine how the allocation of land shares translates into rights to withdraw from a farm enterprise with a share value that can be invested in an alternative enterprise or parcel of land.

2. THE STRUCTURE OF EMPLOYMENT IN UZBEKISTAN’S AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

In 1985, 38 percent of total employment in Uzbekistan was in agriculture. By 1991 agriculture’s share had risen to 42 percent (World Bank 1993, p. 254), and by 1995 to nearly 46 percent. What seems to be happening is that agriculture is absorbing people who have lost their jobs in other sectors. It is doubtful that most of those now recorded as employed in agriculture have formal positions on collective farms. Many have probably moved back to their family homes on the former state and collective farms. This is undoubtedly intensifying the excess labor problem in rural areas, but it is also at least allowing people to produce something on their private plots. (Recall the previous discussion of data that records increasing shares of household income coming from private plots.)

The changing institutional structure of agricultural production may help the sector absorb more workers if small scale, intensive production on smaller land units can be effectively supported

with marketing services. As pointed out, in Uzbekistan this institutional structure has been changing relatively slowly, whereas changes have progressed very rapidly in the Kyrgyz Republic where nearly all state and collective (*kolkhoz*) farms have recently been transformed into private sector enterprises of single or multiple family farms. The labor absorption effects of the contrasting institutional situations should be an important focus of the BASIS research.

The occupational structure of the collective and state farms in Uzbekistan is still similar to that reflected in the data on the one million people employed on state farms in 1990: 2.5 percent of employees worked as farm managers, 8.5 percent as specialists such as economists, veterinarians, etc., 1 percent as “other employees,” and nearly 88 percent as ordinary workers (World Bank 1993, p. 255). It is the upper echelons of this hierarchy who have become the “private” or *dekhkan* farmers in the early phases of farm restructuring. Apparently this was also the case in the early years of restructuring in the Kyrgyz Republic (personal communication, Clara Ismailova, January 1998).

Implications for BASIS research: *It is important to try to determine the gender and age characteristics of employees on state and collective farms, differentiating between regular farm workers, temporary farm workers, management and specialist staff, and people with no formal employment on the former (or current) collective and state farms. An effort could be made to find the raw data of past surveys to determine if gender break-downs can be made. If not, the BASIS research should include historical questions on the gender composition of the rural labor force in order to determine trends in rural employment by type (location, occupation) and by gender and age. It goes without saying that any new data collected on the labor force of leasehold, cooperative, and various forms of private farms should also be distinguished by gender and age as well as occupation and owner/dependent status.*

3. ACCESS TO CREDIT, INPUTS, AND MARKETS

UZBEKISTAN

Geetha Nagarajan, a financial market specialist working with the BASIS project, has described rural financial markets in Uzbekistan as “repressive, underdeveloped and rudimentary, ... comprised of repressive and inefficient formal financial institutions, underdeveloped semi-formal agents and rudimentary informal arrangements” (Nagarajan 1997, p. 1). Banks “function more as conduits for subsidized government funds” to government approved enterprises such as the agricultural cooperatives (former state farms) and collective farms. Banks’ ability to function as independent financial intermediaries is undermined by a very weak deposit base, a situation that is explained in part by the legal constraints within which they operate. Current laws prohibit bank customers from withdrawing cash from his or her own bank account! Payments may only be made to approved organizations by bank transfer (Mearns 1996, pp. 21-3).

The current banking system also discourages expanded production for the market on private plots.⁸ With little access to cash and no access to credit, people who want to sell produce from private plots are usually forced to operate in a restricted barter economy.

⁸ Private plots are the small household gardens nearly every family has traditionally had on state, cooperative, or collective farms (*kolkhoz*).

Leasehold farmers (former collective farm members who lease small plots on the “reorganized” collective farms) must buy their inputs from, and sell most output to, government approved enterprises. This system locks a leasehold farmer into a monopolistic contract system which can literally prevent him from making a profit. The leasehold system can have dire consequences for members of the leaseholder’s household. The wives and adult children who previously earned a wage from the collective farm must now work as family labor for the leaseholder and try to live off the (too often unrealized) “profits” of his “private” farm.

Not all private farmers are cut off from credit, however, or locked into a profit-busting contract system. State controlled prices can be capricious. While they may “break” some farmers, they can “make” others. The more privileged strata of private farmers, for example, such as those with connections to state officials from their positions as collective farm managers, economists, etc., have managed to gain access to “private credit” and rarely have to operate through barter arrangements. Some private farmers from this strata own as much land or livestock as an entire brigade of 30-40 collective farmers managed in the past. Many of these farmers obtained funding from “private sponsors” in order to purchase livestock, buildings, and equipment from a collective farm. A collective farm may also extend credit to the purchaser. In the case of the private livestock farmer the BASIS team visited in January 1998, a loan from private sponsors as well as a loan from the collective farm was reported to have been paid off in one year, apparently from the profits from milk sold to a state-run milk processing enterprise.⁹ Clearly the state controlled prices had not been set to squeeze this enterprise.

“Semi-formal” financial markets, including NGOs that provide financial services, have only just started to emerge in Uzbekistan (Nagarajan 1997). They are not yet able to reach ordinary farmers. Mercy Corps International’s Uzbekistan branch is the only NGO currently active in this area, having begun in 1996. Mercy Corps is working with the Business Women’s Association (an independent NGO) and with Private Farmers Associations to foster the development of Savings and Credit Associations (SCAs). As of 1 December 1997, there were only 147 members in 7 SCAs (WOCCU n.d., pp. 3, 15). Since most SCAs are organized by the Business Women’s Association (BWA), it is estimated that 60-70 percent of SCA members are women.

Other state supported SCAs are being targeted at Private Farmers’ Associations. Unfortunately, the gender composition of the membership of Private Farmers’ Associations is rarely reported. Lestina and Voytan, consultants for the World Council of Credit Unions, for example, interviewed 102 farmers from the 1000 member Ferghana Private Farmers Association in April-May 1996 without mentioning if there were any women farmers among them.

KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Although I have no similar assessment of the credit and rural credit situation in Kyrgyzstan, the Land Tenure Center research interviews of rural committee heads found that 87 percent of them considered the lack of credit as serious, very serious or extremely serious (50 percent for the last category). Similar numbers of respondents rated the lack of fertilizer, farm chemical, fuel, and spare parts or equipment as serious, very serious, or extremely serious (Roth, et al 1996, p. 123).

⁹ The farmer visited had been the *kolkhoz* economist prior to his decision to take up private farming. The land and physical capital he purchased had previously been used by an entire brigade (some 35 collective farmers). As a private farmer, the economist continued to employ 25 of the former livestock brigade workers. Among those retained were eight women. All 10 persons who lost their jobs were men.

Implication for BASIS research: *To understand the impact of gender and socioeconomic differences on access to credit, researchers need to examine the social status of members of SCAs and Private Farmers Associations, that is their status as household heads, dependent youth, wives, female household heads and so forth. Members' professional or occupational status, i.e. skilled vs. unskilled labor, former collective farm workers, professionals from the collective or from other sectors, urban versus rural based members of Business Women's Associations, should also be recorded.*

In a more general sense, the BASIS research must pay particular attention to recording (or, if necessary, estimating) the gender composition of all "private farmers" both as individuals and as members of groups or associations. It should be noted that "women's associations" may well include male "members" if they are among the few organizations to obtain the right to organize credit associations.

Even though women (or men) may not be members of formal organizations, they are likely to have informal networks or groups that they have developed (or could develop) to gain access to inputs, information, credit, etc. The BASIS research should attempt to identify informal groups of this type, since their very existence would indicate the need for making the formal systems more accessible to women.¹⁰ Interviews with women in informal groups or networks could help identify the policy relevant constraints that impede their access to formal credit and other resources.

¹⁰ I am grateful to Dr. Simel Esim of the ICRW for suggesting this point.

V. GENDER ISSUES IN FARM RESTRUCTURING

1. WOMEN'S WORK AND WOMEN'S WAGE EMPLOYMENT

Even though women in Central Asia seem to shoulder the entire responsibility for household maintenance and, to an increasing extent, for childcare, women in both the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan have had very high labor force participation rates. On the collective farms, however, women have formerly held fewer *full time* positions as agricultural wage earners than men, although they are always fully mobilized for the cotton harvest. Women were also less likely than men to hold a job outside the collective or state farm on which the great majority of rural families live. Finally, women have been over-represented in the social sectors (health and education) that have been hard hit by the economic crisis of the 1990s.

Implication for BASIS research: Comparable data on the labor force participation rates and the occupational structure of men and women who reside on farm enterprises will be critical to determining the gender impact of employment changes associated with different models of farm restructuring and macroeconomic reform. People should be asked about their employment situations both before and after restructuring.

2. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN UNEMPLOYMENT RATES (OFFICIAL AND SELF-DECLARED)

There is anecdotal and some survey evidence that women's job loss is outstripping men's. This may vary by rural versus urban occupations. Official rates of unemployment are unlikely to indicate the magnitude or gender and age bias of job loss, so large scale sampling may be needed to uncover the actual impact by age and gender.

There are also indications that sex discrimination may be playing a significant role. Two researchers on the impact of farm restructuring, for example, have suggested that men are getting more jobs in the social service sector as women lose them (Eckert and Elwert 1996, p. 46).

Implication for BASIS research: The research should attempt to estimate the differences between official and actual unemployment rates in the Ferghana Valley by sex, occupation, and age category. Since the impact of the loss of formal employment may be far greater than the loss of a wage or salary, the research should investigate what benefits were lost when people lost their formal employment. One might ask, for example, if a woman is divorced and also loses her job on a collective farm, can she retain (or obtain) access to a house and yard?

It is very important to study how both men and women have reacted to job loss in the formal sector. Subsequent income seeking activities in both formal and informal sectors, as well as changes in self-provisioning of goods (food, housing) and services (tutoring of children, cooking/selling snack foods, etc.) need to be systematically studied.

3. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE IMPACT OF DIFFERENT MODELS OF FARM RESTRUCTURING

Different farm restructuring models are likely to have different gender implications with respect to men's versus women's ability to earn and control income. For example, Eckert and Elwert (1996, p. 27) noted that wives of male leaseholders often gave up their formal jobs on the *kolkhoz* in order to assist the husband with farming, but the household gained little or no benefit when the leasehold contract limited the profit that could be made no matter how well the farm was managed.

Implication for BASIS research: The effects of the whole range of processes of farm restructuring need to be investigated with respect to types of income lost by all household members and the types of income gained. It is important to determine if changes associated with farm restructuring and economic reform have affected men's or women's ability to control the use of income generated by individuals in different relationships to the household head. Women's reasons for exiting or failing to attempt to re-enter formal employment need to be studied in conjunction with their position as family members in rural households undergoing farm restructuring.

BASIS should also study the relationship between farm restructuring, women's loss of employment as wage earners (full time or seasonal), and intra-household decision making processes, especially with respect to decisions about the allocation of women's and household income.

4. GENDER-SPECIFIC EFFECTS OF REDUCTIONS IN SOCIAL SERVICES AND CHILDCARE FACILITIES

The severity of cutbacks in different social service sectors—health, education, and state subsidized daycare and preschools—may differ between Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic. Differences in the pace of farm restructuring and different types and levels of state support for social services are likely to have different effects on the incidence of job loss and changes in wage levels. Since women represent a high share of employees in the social service sectors, job loss in these sectors is likely to have a significant impact on women's employment and incomes. Both these issues require investigation.

It is notable that research on wage and employment changes during Russia's economic transition (Brainerd 1995) found that median female wages fell from 83 percent of male wages in 1991 to only 60 percent of male wages just three years later. The change was not attributable to shorter hours (women actually worked longer hours than men), but to a shift in the overall wage structure that penalized the lower wage positions held disproportionately by women. In other words, women started out in lower wage positions, and when the transition to a privatized economy resulted in a significant increase in wage dispersion between higher and lower paid positions, women lost ground relative to men (*ibid.*, pp. 30-31, 44). There may be a similar phenomenon at work in both the social service and agricultural sectors in Central Asia.

Daycare facilities and after school programs have declined precipitously in the Kyrgyz Republic since fees were introduced (see section two above). While the loss of childcare services may or

may not have had an important impact on women's ability to seek and hold employment in the formal sector, to pursue higher education, or to engage in micro-enterprise endeavors in the informal sector, the loss of these services is likely to have had a greater impact on women than on men. All these issues need to be investigated in order to determine the impact of declining state support for childcare on the labor market and on intra-household labor allocation.

Implication for BASIS research: *A gender breakdown of data on changes in employment by occupational category and of data on changes in wage levels of rural occupations should be collected. The extent and gender-specific wage/employment effects of changes in social services in the health, education, and childcare sectors should be a particular area of concern.*

The research should attempt to determine if and how changes in childcare facilities have affected women's entry into or exit from the labor force. Given the extended family system and the custom of living with the husband's parents,, the availability of non-family based childcare may or may not be a major factor in women's decision to enter or exit the formal labor force. It may, however, affect women's and children's welfare in a manner that is serious enough to have policy implications.

5. PRIVATE PLOTS AND HOUSEHOLD INCOME

In Uzbekistan private plots have contributed a growing share of aggregate household income since 1991, while the shares of real wages and state transfers have declined (see section two above). What is not clear is whether actual output and real income from private plots has increased. The increase in relative share may be offset by the overall decline in real incomes, such that people are neither producing more nor earning more (in an absolute sense) from their private plots.

Eckert and Elwert's (1996, p. 31) research has indicated that private plots and household yards are cultivated mainly by women and children. The fact that these "private plots" yield both food for household consumption and a surplus for sale raises the question of who controls the output from the private plot and the money earned from it.

Implication for BASIS research: *The question of who, within the household, cultivates the private plot and who controls the produce should be systematically investigated at the field level. Do women and/or men have access to a similar "private plot" on various new types of farms, like private multi-family farms? Is there evidence at the field level that both output and incomes from private plots are increasing? If so, how are the benefits from this change distributed within the household. Could more be produced or earned if constraints on financial, capital and commodity markets were eased?*

6. MEN'S AND WOMEN'S LIVESTOCK REARING ROLES AND OWNERSHIP RIGHTS

In many cultures, women own and rear small stock on their own account: they may use the output for family consumption or sell it and use the income for whatever purpose they see fit. If this has been the case for traditional livestock rearing in Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic, the mode of disposing of the livestock (milk cows and goats, in particular) from a "privatized"

state or collective farm or a privatized livestock brigade will have gender implications. If all the livestock is sold to a single private farmer, women can lose access to livestock products they may have formerly consumed or sold. If the animals are distributed among individual households, women have a greater chance of retaining access to milk, eggs, and meat, and may even obtain ownership to small stock.

In Uzbekistan it has been common for the entire livestock rearing operation of a collective farm to be sold to a single person. These operations can be very profitable. One farmer interviewed by the BASIS team was able to pay for a large herd of cattle and sheep in a single year (interview with Mr. Arabayov, Chinov District , 27 January 1998). This mode of privatizing livestock has apparently concentrated income in a few hands.

In the Kyrgyz Republic, a serious economic crisis apparently caused the massive sale and slaughter of livestock after it had been equally distributed among farm households. This loss of livestock was the result of many factors and does not necessarily prove the superiority of the Uzbek policy. How livestock is dealt with during farm restructuring is an important arena for comparative research, and one in which different policies may have different implications for men and for women.

Implication for BASIS research: *Gender roles in livestock rearing and gender specific rights of ownership and/or rights to dispose of livestock or of livestock products should be investigated both for the pre-farm restructuring situation and on various forms of newly created farms. If women formerly earned income from either privately held animals or from animals owned by the collective or state farm, did restructuring change their ownership or use rights and/or their ability to profit from livestock rearing? If livestock was sold to individual farmers, what factors have made the private livestock operations profitable? When livestock is sold to individuals, what has been the impact of the loss of access to the livestock or to livestock products on other members of the collective farm (by age and sex)?*

7. WOMEN'S LAND RIGHTS

Land rights are normally analyzed vis-a-vis households as a unit. This is inadequate when households dissolve or change form or when farm enterprises are transformed. Women's individual land rights are often based on cultural constructions associated with parentage and marriage. Gender and age-specific land rights may vary depending on the quality of the land (irrigated, rain-fed, high or low fertility). The social construction of land rights commonly leaves women with few or no rights to land upon divorce, widowhood or abandonment. Customary land rights can also change radically with farm restructuring. Since land rights are critical to both men's and women's ability to engage in farming, it is important to investigate the gender-specificity of different types of rights to control and to use land of various kinds, both in principle and in practice.

Implication for BASIS research: *The BASIS research should conduct a comparative study of various forms of men's and women's formal and informal land rights in the pre- and post-farm restructuring situations. Women's rights both within and outside marriage should be identified. Reasons for (and the impact of) the loss of various types of land rights should be studied to assess the policy and legal implications of developing measures to protect the rights of*

individuals in disadvantaged social situations, such as women and children who do not have husbands or fathers.

8. WOMEN'S OFF-FARM EMPLOYMENT/SELF EMPLOYMENT

The January 1998 BASIS mission was told that in Uzbekistan more men than women have jobs outside the collective farms or local villages (interviews at Kim Pen Khwa collective farm, 21-22 January 1998). On one large collective farm located near Tashkent, however, several small and medium scale rural industries have been created, including a joint venture with Bangladesh for cotton spinning and a ready made clothing enterprise. The work force in the cotton spinning plant is predominantly young women. Since cotton production and spinning (as well as food processing) is highly developed in the Ferghana Valley, there may be a similar set of opportunities for young women. The location and occupational structure of men's and women's work needs to be investigated by age and educational category, both by area and for the country as a whole.

It is also possible that an informal sector is emerging in both Uzbekistan and the Kyrgyz Republic in which people are creating self-employment as traders, food processors, and other types of micro-entrepreneurs. Research into the characteristics of the emerging informal sector (including gender aspects), the identification of conditions that are constraining or encouraging its development, and the relationship of all these factors to farm restructuring could all have important policy implications.

***Implication for BASIS research:** The age, gender, and household position of rural residents who are employed in non-agricultural, formal jobs should be investigated. Given the patriarchal traditions of the Central Asian region, researchers should also investigate who (within the household) controls the off-farm income earned by wives and dependents, and who decides which family members should seek off-farm employment in the formal sector. Men's and women's self-employment in the off-farm informal sector (retail trade, micro-enterprise) or in non-agricultural self-employment carried out on the farm (food processing, tutoring school children) should also be studied, with attention to the situation both before and after farm restructuring.*

9. SURPLUS LABOR AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS WITH PRIVATIZATION

As pointed out earlier in this report (section three), the World Bank's 1993 publication, *Uzbekistan: An Agenda for Economic Reform*, suggested that the severity of the potential unemployment problem under privatization might not be as great as feared if women were to "voluntarily" withdraw from the labor force and return to the household. The idea that many Uzbek women would *want* to leave their jobs is based on the fact that women's labor force participation rates are lower in most other parts of the world. Thus, it is assumed that women's very high labor force participation rates throughout the former Soviet Union is somehow artificial and inimical to women's interests. Kuehnast's (1993) interviews with several hundred unemployed women in the Kyrgyz Republic challenge this assumption.

There are several factors that can force women out of the labor force, be they willing or not. An important one that seems to be taking place in both Russia and Central Asia is gender-biased firing when firms and farms are privatized. Another is gender-biased hiring. A third might be increased patriarchal control over women's employment options, especially if male private farmers want women to work on the family farm or if multi-family farms require women's unpaid participation in order to become profitable.

There are many scenarios that could be taking place, including some that may produce better formal employment opportunities for women than for men. This could be the case if it is felt that women in certain categories (such as young, unmarried women) can be paid less than men. All these possibilities need to be investigated in order to understand the options that different groups in the rural labor force have, and how the existence of these options (or constraints) affect their ability to maintain or improve their welfare under farm restructuring.

***Implications for BASIS research:** The research should focus heavily on changes in men's and women's employment histories and options over the course of the transition. Work in the home, on private farm land, in the informal sector, and in the formal sector must be distinguished. All types of work should be analyzed to assess the importance of monetary and in-kind income associated with it. This research should begin with open discussions in gender-specific focus groups in order to identify major patterns in changing work/employment opportunities and histories. Various patterns or trajectories that have been distinguished should be researched in two ways: (1) case studies to determine the income and welfare implications of different trajectories, and (2) surveys to determine the relative incidence of the most important scenarios of employment change.*

10. LABOR TIMES AND GENDER ROLES IN THE ALLOCATION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Macroeconomic reforms, privatization of the industrial and service sectors, and farm restructuring will all have different impacts on different segments of the population. Among these impacts are changes in monetary income, changes in in-kind income, and changes in total labor time (including unpaid domestic labor time). Changes in monetary income can also have an impact on an individual's influence over the allocation of household or personal income. These changes need to be investigated for various population groups, distinguished by gender, age, and socioeconomic status.

***Implication for BASIS research:** Since time is an important component of welfare, both for the individual and for those who depend on that individual for care, it should be an important component of the analysis of the effects of farm restructuring and privatization, in general. As part of an initial participatory research phase with different focus groups, the effects of farm restructuring on overall work time and on specific types of labor time (paid, unpaid with an in-kind return, domestic or reproductive work time) need to be explored for different segments of the population. Once basic patterns are discerned, their incidence can be investigated with larger survey instruments.*

VI. GENDER ISSUES IN THE FIRST STAGE OF THE RESEARCH

Although the BASIS research in Central Asia is not necessarily time bound, there are two initial stages to the research project in the Ferghana Valley:

1. short-term research period from the research planning workshop to March/April 1998
2. three year research period (funded annually) for which a research plan will be more fully elaborated.

No fieldwork was conducted during the first stage, but much of the research of the second stage is expected to focus on fieldwork in the Ferghana Valley, specifically on the Andijan Region in Uzbekistan and the Osh Region in the Kyrgyz Republic.

During the first stage of the research, working groups in each country compiled existing statistical data and reviewed legislation to answer specific questions in six areas: land, labor and income, water, mechanization, finance, and farm restructuring. To the extent possible, statistical data was gathered for the country as a whole and for the Andijan and Osh Regions (*oblast*). In both cases data was recorded for 1991 and 1996 (and 1997 if available).

This sub-section comments on the research questions set for the first stage of the research (a partial set of these questions is listed in the annex). Suggestions are made here to indicate how the second stage of the research might attempt to gather data that cannot be found in official sources or elaborate issues raised by the data that is available. These comments are based on meetings held with four of the six research sub-groups formed to carry out the first stage research in Uzbekistan.

1. LAND

In the investigation of land legislation, it is unlikely that the official legislation will involve discrimination on the basis of gender for various types of land tenure. Two questions on land transactions, however, may find gender-specificity in the legislation: (1) How is land held in common share or common joint ownership divided? (2) What are the rules about division of land in case of divorce or death of a spouse? In the statistical data on land, only the number of titles granted each year from 1991 to 1997 will be investigated. It must still be determined if data is kept at the local level by the gender of the person (or owner of the entity) holding the title.

The second stage of the research will be an opportunity to investigate the gender aspects of land tenure in practice.

2. LABOR

Questions on data related to labor and income are more gender specific. All demographic data, rural/urban breakdowns, employment data (by sector and by occupational category) and surplus labor estimates are to be broken down by sex and age.

It is not clear if either external or internal migration data is reported by sex or by age in Uzbekistan. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) published a migration study for Uzbekistan in 1997, but it concentrates almost exclusively on the nationalities of external immigrants and emigrants. It is likely that information on urban/rural and rural/urban migration will have to be collected during the fieldwork. Data should be collected by sex, age, and occupational category.

In the legislative area, the research is attempting to determine if there are any safety or other work related rules that affect men and women differently, if there are any legal disincentives for women to engage in any types of agricultural work, and if there are any legal rules restricting migration that differ by age or sex. We know that the pension age is 55 for women and 60 for men, but the research should also investigate whether or not there are requirements to leave work at retirement age that may effect men and women in the agricultural sector differently from others.

3. WATER

The statistical questions on water investigate sources and uses of water by amounts used in different sectors. It is also studying water costs and rainfall data. The legal issues regarding water rights could have gender implications, especially in the relationship between water rights and land rights, and in the (potentially) different rules for access to water by different types of agricultural enterprises. Access to water for private plots, for example, may be of greater importance to women's income and welfare than to men's.

4. MECHANIZATION

Among the legal issues with potentially different implications by gender is the question of whether or not collective farm members have a right to a share of the property (non-land assets) of the farm if they withdraw from the collective to start a private farm. The formal and informal rules for the allocation and use of machinery in leasehold farms also need to be investigated. The criteria upon which the division of farm assets is made could discriminate against women if they are based on the number of years a person has been employed by the collective farm . Women who live on collective farms are more likely to be part-time employees than men, more likely to have worked in non-agricultural sectors like education and health than men, and more likely to have left the labor force for child-bearing and rearing than men. Any of these factors might make a woman less eligible to receive shares in farm equipment than men.

5. FINANCE

The legal questions about access to agricultural loans, in particular, who can borrow, could have gender implications if borrowing is predicated upon the holding of land titles or land shares in one's own name. The research should determine if existing loan data or data on owners of savings accounts has been disaggregated by gender.

6. RESTRUCTURING

Among the legal issues that may have gender-differentiated impacts are the legal procedures for individuals or families to obtain agricultural land, the method of distributing land and property when an agricultural enterprise is restructured, and the criteria for determining to whom (agricultural workers, social sphere workers, pensioners, etc.) land and property will be distributed. There are also gender implications in the existence (or non-existence) of legislation that shifts the financing of social services, such as day care, after-school programs and health facilities, to local governments or to consumers. Any changes in the location, costs, and availability of health, education, and childcare services accompanying restructuring should be noted.

The specific questions on restructuring that have gender implications are the average number of workers or shareholders of agricultural enterprises by type, age category, and sex, and the status of the provision of social services (schools, kindergartens, canteens, health clinics) by type of provider (state, district, farm enterprise, private).

VII. ISSUES AND QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE IN THE SECOND STAGE OF THE RESEARCH

This section expands on several of the research issues outlined at the Tashkent planning workshop. Under each workshop-identified topic, research questions that can illuminate related gender and socioeconomic difference issues are proposed. These questions should be seen as examples of *potential* research questions. As new information becomes available, many of these questions will need to be refined, expanded or perhaps discarded.

The section also include issues and questions which have already been highlighted (in italics) in the preceding sections of this report. Some of these fit under the issues identified at the workshop and some are included separately.

A preliminary methodological note: In order to capture socioeconomic differences, it is proposed that most of the research dealing with household issues be carried out in interviews with focus groups or using sample survey techniques that separate two different types of household:

1. households which had skilled employees on pre-reform state and collective farms (e.g., farm managers, economists, mechanics, tractor drivers)
2. households with only farm laborers on pre-reform collective farms.

Other categories of household, such as those in which several nuclear families live in a single house (a sign of poverty) or households with social service workers, or with members who work in urban areas, or women headed households should also be distinguished for some of the issues.

1. PROPOSED RESEARCH QUESTIONS TO INVESTIGATE GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCES

Note: Most of the questions in this section should be studied for two periods: before and after restructuring.

LAND AND WATER

Workshop Issue 3:¹¹ Distribution of land to the user (by category and type)

1. What are the differences between men's and women's land rights (e.g., ability to use land for self-determined purposes, to inherit, to transfer to others, etc.) in law, custom, and current practice? This question should be posed for all different types of farm enterprises and should be studied separately for different types of households.
2. How are water rights associated with land rights? Does this differ by gender, household position, farm type?
3. Which categories of household members (household head, female spouse, married vs. single man, single woman, male and female youth) can obtain access to land and water for farming

¹¹ The numbering of the research issues follows that of the Tashkent workshop listing.

or livestock rearing on their own account, i.e., where they control the income generated? Does this vary by type of farm enterprise? By socioeconomic status? By gender of the head of household?

4. Who, in households located on collective/state farms, cultivates the private plot? Who controls the produce? Do women and/or men have access to the same type of “private plot”? Are there gender differences in access to additional private garden plots on new types of farms, such as private multi-family farms, leasehold farms, etc.?
5. What happens to the land rights of different household members if the household is split by divorce, abandonment, death of the household head?

Workshop Issue 4: Study of institutions taking part in land distribution

1. Who are the formal and the non-formal decision-makers in various processes associated with land distribution? What is the gender and socioeconomic profile of each group of decision-makers? Would a different socioeconomic and gender profile of decision-makers be expected to have different outcomes in terms of who gets land and water rights? If so, what evidence is there to support this hypothesis?
2. What are the formal and non-formal, but influential, criteria upon which land distribution decisions are made? What socioeconomic, gender, and age/family status groups are favored by these criteria? To what extent does the profile of actual land recipients reflect formal versus informal criteria of different types?

Workshop Issue 5: Research on land quality before and after farm restructuring

1. If household members have individual land rights, is there any systematic difference between the quality of land allocated to men and women, especially on land that can be farmed on their own account?
2. Is there any systematic difference in the type of land (irrigated, rain-fed, pasture, other) allocated to men and women from different socioeconomic groups?
3. Is there any systematic difference in the type or quality of land allocated to male-headed versus female-headed households from different socioeconomic or age groups?
4. Is there any evidence that men’s and women’s farming practices differ in a manner that affects the quality of the land?

Workshop Issue 6: Productivity and yield on arable land

1. Is there any difference in the yields obtained by men versus women farmers working on the same type (irrigated, rain-fed, yard, supplementary garden, etc.) and quality of land?

Workshop Issue 7: Taxes and rent for different land types

1. Is there any difference in the taxes and rent paid for the same type and quality of land by households from different socioeconomic categories? Does this differ according to the sex of the household head?

LABOR AND INCOMES

Comparable data on the labor force participation rates and the occupational structure of men and women involved in the farm enterprises studied will be critical to determining the gender impact

of employment changes associated with different models of reform and of farm restructuring. The research should focus heavily on changes in men's and women's employment options and employment histories over the course of farm restructuring.

The age, gender, and household position of people who live on the farm but work in non-agricultural wage or salaried employment should be investigated. Given the patriarchal traditions of the area, researchers should also investigate who (within the household) controls the off-farm income earned by wives and by male and female dependents, and who decides which family members should seek off-farm employment in the formal sector.

Men's and women's self-employment in the off-farm informal sector (retail trade, micro-enterprise) or in non-agricultural self-employment carried out on the farm (food processing, tutoring school children) should also be studied both before and after-farm restructuring. Finally, work in the home and on private farm land should be analyzed to assess the importance of monetary and in-kind income associated with it.

Since time is an important component of welfare, both for the individual and for his or her dependents, changes in labor times should be an important component of the analysis of the effects of farm restructuring and privatization. The effects of farm restructuring on overall labor time and on specific types of labor time (paid, unpaid with an in-kind return, domestic or reproductive work time) need to be explored.

The research on all types of work (employment, household maintenance, production for own use, and so forth) should begin with open discussions in gender-specific focus groups. This will allow the researchers to identify major patterns in changing work and employment opportunities and histories. Various patterns or trajectories that have been distinguished should be researched in two ways: (1) case studies to determine the income and welfare implications of different trajectories, and (2) surveys to determine the relative incidence of the most important scenarios of employment change.

Workshop Issue 4: Study of changes in the structure and purchasing power of household incomes in the course of farm restructuring by farm type (private farms, leasehold farms, collectives) in each region.

Each of the following questions should be investigated for all farm types and should distinguish among households from different socioeconomic categories.

1. What are the sources of household income on different types of farms?
2. What household members (by gender, age, and household position) contribute what types of monetary and in-kind income? (Household services such as childcare, cooking, house repair can be included by noting the hours spent on these tasks.)
3. What changes have taken place in the purchasing power of each source of income in the past several years? (Note: The number of years over which historical data should be collected should be specified after initial research indicates the most relevant period of change. How to measure changes in purchasing power should be discussed among the different research teams so that a common method can be used.)
4. What changes have taken place in the amount of work (hours or days) each household member spends on each source of income?

5. What are the most profitable sources of income for the household? How has this changed over the past several years?

Workshop Issue 6: Study of relationships between changes in employment opportunities and changes in household and individual incomes (by age, sex, and occupation) over the course of farm restructuring in each region.

It is important to try to determine the gender and age characteristics of employees on state and collective farms, differentiating between regular farm workers, temporary farm workers, management and specialist staff, and people with no formal employment on the collective and state farms. An effort could be made to find the raw data of past surveys to determine if gender break-downs can be made. If not, the BASIS research should include historical questions on the gender composition of the rural labor force in order to study trends in rural employment by type (location, occupation) and by gender and age. All new data collected on the labor forces of different types of farm enterprises should be distinguished by gender and age as well as by occupation and owner or dependent status.

1. How have formal employment positions and other types of work (informal sector jobs, production on private plots, domestic work) changed for different household members (by gender, age, household position) over the past several years?
2. What types of jobs have been lost by sex, age, socioeconomic and occupational status? What new types of jobs or other work have been taken up by different groups?
3. What are the differences in income between jobs that were lost and new work taken up by various categories of household members? (Note: How to ask this question and how to measure changes in income are sensitive methodological issues that should be addressed by the research team and agreed upon before the field research takes place.)
4. Women's reasons for leaving and/or not trying to find a job in the formal sector need to be studied. Women should be categorized by their positions as wives, daughters, widows or household heads of rural households undergoing some form of farm restructuring. Their training and job experience should also be noted.
5. What are the effects of losing access to different types of income? Of gaining access to other types of income? Have those changes affected men's or women's ability to control the use of they themselves generate? Does this vary by an individual's relationship to the household head?
6. Since the impact of the loss of formal employment may be far greater than the loss of a wage or salary, the research should investigate what social services, access to housing, and other benefits are lost when people lose jobs in the formal sector. If a woman is divorced, for example, and also loses her job on a collective farm, can she retain (or obtain) access to a house and yard?
7. The research should attempt to estimate the differences between official and actual unemployment rates in the Ferghana Valley by sex, occupation, and age category.

Workshop Issue 7: Trends in migration patterns in Andijan and Osh Regions.

1. What household members have either returned to the farm or left the farm over the past several years (by sex, age, household position, and occupational status)? What was the reason for each person's leaving or return?

2. What type of work does each person who migrated or returned do now? What type of work did he/she do previously?

FINANCE

Workshop Issue 1: Sources of finance and structure of its use

This topic can be investigated at several levels, including the informal credit market (e.g., loans among friends or in informal savings/credit groups like revolving credit associations) and the semi-formal market (donor supported NGOs or international NGOs) as well as the formal financial market. All levels and types of credit should be included in the research.

1. What are the sources of credit actually received by farmers and micro-entrepreneurs living on former state and collective farms? A survey may be used to estimate the percentage of persons in various social groups (by sex, age, occupation) who have access to different types of credit, including loans from friends and relatives.
2. To understand the impact of gender and socioeconomic differences in access to credit, researchers need to examine the gender and family status of members of SCAs and Private Farmer Associations (household heads, dependent youth, etc.) as well as their professional or occupational status (skilled vs. unskilled labor, former collective farm workers, professionals in non-farm sectors, etc.).
3. For what purposes have various rural social groups sought credit?
4. Who are the “sponsors” who have financed the emerging private farmers in Uzbekistan? What is needed in order to obtain access to relatively large loans from private parties? What are the terms of these loans?

Workshop Issue 4: Access to formal credit and saving services by farmers

1. What are the socioeconomic, age, and gender characteristics of farmers who have received loans from formal financial institutions?
2. Are there any legal or administrative criteria for the identification and vetting of borrowers that discriminate by sex, age, or occupation?

Workshop Issue 5: Accumulation of financial resources (savings) by agricultural enterprises

1. In what form do different types of agricultural enterprises accumulate and store financial resources?
2. Do women-run agricultural enterprises accumulate and store savings differently from male-run enterprises? If so, describe the differences and discuss their rationale.

Workshop Issue 6: Structure of the demand for credit

1. What are the occupational, wealth, gender, and age characteristics of individuals who seek credit for different purposes (productive investment, consumption, personal emergencies, etc.)?

Workshop Issue 7: Possibilities for savings mobilization by the rural population

1. From interviews with different focus groups (by sex, age, occupation, etc.), determine how different groups attempt to save (for example by purchasing small livestock or jewelry,

joining revolving credit and savings associations, and so forth). What is the relative importance of different types of savings to different social groups?

2. What requirements do male and female farmers or micro-entrepreneurs or small business people have for institutions such as banks or SCAs that would induce them to use these institutions for savings?

Workshop Issue 8: Possibilities for transferring financial resources from the urban to the rural sector.

1. What investments have urban-based men and women made in various types of rural enterprises, including farms, equipment, livestock?
2. What are the occupational, age, gender characteristics of urban residents who have made investments in rural enterprises?
3. What other types of individual transfers are made among urban and rural residents? Note the sex, age, and occupational characteristics and the kinship or other types of relationships among individuals conducting these types of transfers.

RESTRUCTURING, MECHANIZATION, AND LABOR USE

Workshop issue 9 from the land section, issue 9 from mechanization, and issue 3 from restructuring. Relationships between changes in the intensity of land use and the demand for labor over the course of farm restructuring in each region, with particular attention to the influence of changing patterns of mechanization on the demand for labor. Mechanisms for allocating labor and providing incentives for labor under different forms of farm management.

Questions for *managers* of each type of farm:

1. How has the total number of people employed on the farm changed over the past 5-8 years?
2. How many male and female farm workers were employed 5 years ago? How many are currently employed? (Farm workers with different occupational categories and skill levels should be distinguished; e.g., livestock workers, crop production workers, tractor drivers, etc.)
3. How has the structure of farm management positions changed? What jobs have been eliminated or added? How many managers or specialists in each category have lost their jobs (by specialty and gender)? How many new specialist or managerial jobs have been added (by specialty and gender)?
4. What are the reasons for the changes? Have there been changes in cropping patterns, technology, mechanization? Were there changes in incentives, the prices of inputs, outputs? Was there an attempt to increase profits by reducing the number of workers? Were there new opportunities?
5. Who made the decisions about the reallocation of labor? Who participated in the decision-making process at the farm, district and regional levels?
6. What incentives (wages, other benefits) were offered to people newly employed in the various positions discussed above? For what categories of worker, specialist, or manager have real wages and benefits improved or declined?

7. What compensation, if any, was given to people who lost their jobs and were not offered a new position?
8. What impact have former and current forms of mechanization in production and crop processing had on the changing employment situation? Is the type of technology used the major factor in determining what type of labor is needed?
9. Are the sex and age characteristics of workers related to particular occupations that are in greater or lesser demand due to current patterns of mechanization?
10. Is there any flexibility in making choices about the use of current equipment, machinery, etc. that could alleviate the surplus labor problem? If yes, what could be done?
11. To what extent has the type of mechanization used in crop and livestock production determined the feasibility of different types of farm restructuring and the sizes of the resulting farm enterprises?
12. Are there differences in the ability of men and women to gain access to mechanization services? Are these services essential if one is to succeed as a private farmer? Explain the factors that improve and or impede a farmer's access to mechanization for crop and livestock production and for crop and livestock product processing.

Workshop Issue 6 from farm restructuring section: The impact of restructuring on labor and incomes, mechanization, water distribution, financial requirements, storage and processing, and marketing.

1. What has been the impact of restructuring at the household level on overall employment and incomes? Households should be differentiated by socioeconomic status (occupational and other criteria are suggested above) and the sex of the household head.
2. What has been the impact of restructuring on the employment and incomes of different population groups by sex, age, socioeconomic status; e.g., on young men and women from farm management versus farm worker households?
3. Has farm restructuring differentially affected individual access to mechanization for crop production? If so, what are the differences by sex, age, occupation?
4. Have the financial requirements of establishing different types of farm enterprises affected the profile of private farmers (by sex, age, former occupation)? If so, what are the characteristics of groups that have been excluded? What types of financial services do different excluded groups say they would need in order to become either individual private farmers or members of a multi-family farm enterprise?
5. Has farm restructuring affected the types of processing and storage used for crops and livestock products? If so, describe the changes and cite any changes in the gender, age and occupational categories of people involved in these processes.
6. Have any new opportunities become available for individuals or households to engage in micro-enterprises related to crop or livestock product processing as a result of restructuring? If so, describe the new opportunities and investigate the gender, age and occupational categories of people involved in new micro-enterprises.
7. Have any new opportunities become available for individuals or households to engage in marketing enterprises for crops or livestock products as a result of restructuring? If so,

describe the new opportunities and investigate the gender, age, and occupational categories of people involved in crop and livestock marketing.

8. The research on farm restructuring must not only to investigate the employment, unemployment, and migration status of farm residents, but also to try to understand the underlying factors contributing to age, sex, and occupational differences in the distribution of the labor force between the formal and informal sectors. We need to investigate what people who are underemployed in the formal sector do in order to supplement family income from outside the formal sector.
9. The data on the increasing contribution of private plots to aggregate household income may indicate that an informal private sector is developing based on production from private plots. If job loss is indeed skewed against women, female unemployment may be pushing women into the informal sector at a faster rate than men. The gender, age and socioeconomic characteristics of entrants into the informal sector need to be investigated at the field level, as does the form and level of remuneration associated with socioeconomic, age, and gender differences.

Issues not raised at the Tashkent workshop

1. Gender roles in livestock rearing and gender specific rights of ownership and rights to dispose of livestock and livestock products should be investigated both in the pre-restructuring situation and in different types of newly created farms. If women formerly earned income from either privately held animals or from animals owned by the collective or state farm, how did restructuring change women's rights and their ability to profit from livestock rearing?
2. Since changes in women's and men's access to education will affect the gender composition of employment, the gender composition of government decision-makers, and gender aspects of the income structure, data on male and female enrollment in educational institutions at all levels should be collected. Both men's and women's assessment of current declines in women's participation in the higher levels of the educational and employment hierarchies should be investigated.
3. The research on the effects of farm restructuring in the Ferghana Valley should assess the impact of increasing female unemployment on women's and children's welfare in terms of access to subsidies, day care and other services, etc. Data should be collected on changes in the availability of day care and after-school programs. The effects of farm restructuring on childcare should be studied from the mothers' perspective. It should attempt to determine if and how changes in the availability of subsidized childcare facilities have affected women's entry into or exit from the labor force.
4. It has been suggested that increasing male and female unemployment may be leading to increasing family dissolution (abandonment or divorce) as well as an increasing rate of domestic violence and alcoholism. If this is true, government may want to deal with the problem at a policy level. Men and women need to be interviewed separately both to investigate changes in domestic violence, alcoholism, and family dissolution and to determine if and how women retain access to resources and income in the event of divorce or abandonment.

VIII. GENDER AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIFFERENCE SENSITIVE RESEARCH METHODS

1. DEALING WITH CULTURALLY SENSITIVE ISSUES

Because the initial review of legislative issues and existing statistical data is unlikely to provide extensive information on the gender implications of farm restructuring and economic reform, the most important gender and socioeconomic differences in the impact on farm restructuring must be sought in field research. The findings of the fieldwork stage of the research, to the extent that they uncover differences in the impact of reform policies and practices based on socioeconomic and gender differences, can be expected to have important implications for future policy. It is therefore critical that differences in impact by sex, age group, and socioeconomic status be taken very seriously in planning the second or fieldwork stage of the research.

Here methodological questions will be paramount. One method strongly emphasized by gender experts is the use of focus groups to obtain information from men and women separately. In most cultural situations, this is critical if women are to feel free to discuss socially, culturally or economically sensitive issues. Researchers must be aware, however, that requests to meet with women, youth, or people from poor households in separate groups may be met with suspicion or even resistance by local authorities and/or male elders. If important gender and socioeconomic issues that may be culturally sensitive are not to be omitted from the research, this problem must be anticipated and dealt with.

The best approach is to discuss the problem openly and in advance with all research teams, seeking ideas about how to explain the goals, the specific questions to be investigated, and the policy importance of the research to all persons involved. It is also critical to seek ideas from rural women themselves about how and where to investigate issues that are “gender-sensitive” in the sense that they can cause tension and public disputes between men and women. Women should never be asked sensitive questions about assets or income, intra-household decision making or domestic violence in public settings. Any issues that might place women or other minority groups at risk of retribution should be discussed only in separate focus groups. When researchers meet with gender and age-specific groups, informants will have the opportunity to make the researchers aware of the sensitivity of different issues and to suggest how information about these issues might best be obtained.

2. A PROPOSED METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The following remarks and suggestions are focused only on methods to investigate the research questions presented in this report. Even then, not all relevant research methods are covered. For example, case studies of different types of farms, households, informal sector activities, etc. might also be useful but are not discussed here.

In order to better focus the research on the most important issues in the Ferghana Valley, the fieldwork should begin with rapid and participatory rural appraisal methods. Once the basic

outlines of the most important impact issues are understood, more systematic survey and case study research can be planned to investigate the scope and incidence of those issues with greatest policy relevance.

3. FIELDWORK: PART ONE

I would suggest that the field research begin by focusing on participatory problem identification and analysis using the tools of rapid rural appraisal (RRA) and participatory rural appraisal (PRA). Professional researchers (who may need to be trained in PRA methods) and villagers should meet together in gender, age, and occupationally distinct focus groups with the aim of exploring the impact of economic reforms and farm restructuring on each group's land rights, labor and incomes (including formal employment, informal sector participation, and agricultural and domestic work for household consumption), and access to means of production like water, mechanized technology, and finance.¹²

TOOLS

Many appropriate gender and socioeconomic difference sensitive tools for RRA and PRA are available in publications being developed by the Women in Development Service of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. The WID Service has developed four handbooks in an on-going series entitled *SEAGA: Socioeconomic and Gender Analysis Programme*. The field level handbook describes an excellent set of tools for participatory livelihood analysis (farming systems, time use, income and expenditure analysis, etc.) as well as for problem identification, analysis, and priority ranking. There is also a handbook focused on institutional analysis, one on macroeconomic policy analysis and a special handbook on irrigation.

ANALYSIS

A preliminary analysis of the results of focus group sessions and key informant interviews should be conducted by the research team (perhaps with representatives from the focus groups) before the research team leaves each research site. This analysis should be presented to the focus groups for correction and further elaboration. It should then be discussed in a larger public meeting. (Focus groups may bring up certain sensitive issues that they do not want presented publicly. In such cases researchers must be sure to explore this possibility with focus groups and to respect all requests for confidentiality.)

Once the RRA/PRA have been conducted in several research sites, the research team should engage in a larger comparative analysis. One of the goals of this process would be to identify those issues on which more systematic information should be collected in larger surveys. A second goal would be to highlight the issues that are considered important by a wide range of focus groups of a particular type; e.g., male and female youth from farm worker households, married women from farm worker households, women who head their own households, etc.

¹² Before small groups are formed, it is of course essential to have meetings with village and farm leaders as well as information sharing meetings with all community members who may be interested.

DISSEMINATION OF PRA/RRA RESULTS

Reports on the village level participatory analysis should be distributed to the village or farm leaders and to representatives of the different focus groups that have been involved. Once a comparative analysis has been done and critical issues that require further research have been identified, the results should be discussed with the villagers from the original research sites (to the extent possible). Written interim reports could be distributed to all participating communities. New information or an increased emphasis on particular issues might result from this process.

TRAINING THE RESEARCH TEAM IN RRA/PRA METHODS

Many people on the research team, including the senior researchers from government and academic institutions, may not be familiar with the methods and tools of PRA, especially those that facilitate socioeconomic difference and gender analysis. The research team should be trained in PRA/RRA methods before the fieldwork is initiated. All researchers need be able to work with PRA/RRA methods so that they can better evaluate the results of participatory analysis results.

I suggest a two-part training program. The first would be to bring the research teams in each country together for a two day workshop on PRA/RRA. The organizers of the workshop should prepare for it by conducting an abbreviated PRA-type exercise in the Ferghana Valley. The results of that exercise would be used in the two day workshop to illustrate the potential outcomes from using different PRA tools for the identification and elaboration of research issues and questions. The two-day workshop would only introduce the range of methods and tools. It's purpose would be to convince senior researchers of the validity and usefulness of the approach and to interest them in learning more. Some senior researchers might thereby be motivated to participate in the longer training program in PRA that is recommended for those who will actually conduct the RRA/PRA field research.

The second part of the training program would be focused on the field research team. This would be a program of some 7-10 days in which actual field research would be conducted to apply the research tools being taught. The persons trained in this session would be the core of the PRA/RRA research team. Later, during the actual field research, they themselves might also train local collaborators in each research area.

4. FIELDWORK: PART TWO

Questions or issues that cannot be adequately investigated with rapid appraisal methods, especially the frequency and distribution of specific problems or reform/restructuring impact indicators, will need to be investigated with more formal survey methods. The design and analysis of these surveys should involve several members from the different sub-groups of the research team, with major participation by those who have carried out the RRAs/PRA. It is recommended that the local collaborators who participated in the PRA/RRAs be engaged as survey enumerators for the second stage of the fieldwork. This would allow them to deepen their research and analysis skills and to apply these skills to better represent interests of the community in the future.

Results of the various surveys conducted should be shared not only among national and regional level policymakers, government representatives, farmer representatives, NGOs, and so forth, but also among representatives of the various focus groups who participated in the RRA/PRA stage

of the field research. Representatives from these groups should be invited to workshops in which the second stage results are discussed. As a supplementary dissemination activity, the final research results might also be discussed in public meetings in the communities where the RRA/PRA exercises took place.

As a general principle, during all phases of the field research, research teams should make a point of continually informing not only officials and farm managers, but the entire community, both about the objectives and methods of the research, and about the results of each phase of the research. This will serve several purposes, including providing wider networks for feedback on the research, and alleviating the inevitable suspicion and curiosity about why the research is taking place.

It will be important for the validity of the research results to pay close and continual attention to transparency about the research issues and methods at all levels. Taking the time to fully explain goals and methods of the research before it is conducted at official, community, and focus group levels, and then later returning to discuss the results at all these levels will require time, patience, and money. This will not only improve the quality of the results, but can also serve to increase the interest of policymakers in the research.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PARTICIPATION OF G/WID ASSISTANCE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BASIS RESEARCH

There are three areas in which future assistance from gender/women in development experts could be important:

- participation in designing the fieldwork,
- providing training for the research teams in gender and socioeconomic difference sensitive participatory rural appraisal methods, and,
- participation in planning research questionnaires and sample surveys.

It is important that several of the researchers who will supervise and/or carry out the field research have some expertise in gender and socioeconomic difference sensitive research methods. While the proposed in-country training might be adequate for building this expertise, it will also be useful to have an experienced RRA/WID expert participate in some of the early field research. This person would help orient and supervise the field research teams as they conduct the first RRA/PRA sessions and analyze the results.

A G/WID and PRA/RRA expert's language skills will be a critical factor in the success of his or her involvement in the above activities. Knowledge of Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages would be ideal. Knowledge of Russian would allow the same expert to be involved in training and research planning in both countries.

For the PRA training, language skills are critical. If an expert with PRA, gender analysis, and appropriate language skills is not available, I would suggest that BASIS consider sending a local expert who knows both English and Uzbek or Russian and who is knowledgeable about issues of concern to rural women to be trained in gender-sensitive PRA. A second expert from the Kyrgyz Republic should also be trained. PRA training might be obtained at the eight-week PRA training session at Egerton University in Kenya which is usually held in August. If this is not feasible, the Women in Development Service of FAO can be contacted for information about other training programs. FAO can also supply excellent training materials.

Alternatively, a foreign expert in gender and socioeconomic-sensitive PRA could conduct the training and participate in research design *with the constant assistance of an interpreter who is fluent in the relevant local language and Russian*. An ideal situation would be to have a local gender analysis expert who is trilingual and who is interested in learning RRA/PRA techniques and in participating in the field research to act as interpreter for the PRA/gender analysis expert.

Either of these options have budgetary implications (for external training or for the engagement of an interpreter) that should be fully provided for if the research is to be oriented in the manner proposed in this report.

X. INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES FOR SUPPORTING GENDER-SENSITIVE RESEARCH IN THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC AND UZBEKISTAN

This section lists institutions and individuals who should be contacted regarding gender and socioeconomic issues in the BASIS Central Asian research. Basic information about their work and contact telephone numbers, email addresses, etc. are provided.

1. BASIS COORDINATORS IN UZBEKISTAN AND KYRGYZSTAN

Alim S. Pulatov

Director

Center for International Development and Training

Tashkent Institute of Engineers of Irrigation and Agriculture Mechanization

39 Kary-Niyazova Street

Tashkent 700000

Uzbekistan

Tel: 7-3712-353-379

Fax: 7-3711-331-439

email: admin@tiame.uz OR alim@cer.freenet.uz

Klara Ismailova

Associate Professor

Chair of Land Management, Kyrgyz Agrarian Academy

President of Kyrgyz Republic Association of Land Managers

68 Mederov Street

Bishkek 72000

The Kyrgyz Republic

Tel: 996-3312-441-797

Fax: 996-3321-444-707

email: klara@infokaa.freenet.bishkek.su

2. NGOs FORMED BY WOMEN RESEARCHERS, ACTIVISTS, AND BUSINESS ENTREPRENEURS IN UZBEKISTAN AND THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC

Women's Resource Center (Zgenski resursni tsentre)

11 Abdulla Kadiri Prospect

Tashkent 700011

Uzbekistan

Tel: (7-3712) 418931 or 354878 or 412949

email: marfua@silk.glas.apc.org

Chairperson: Marfua Tokhtakhodjaeva

Organized as an independent, self-financed NGO in 1995, the Women's Resource Center has about 30 members. Most are university trained professionals active in research, advocacy, and organizational work with grassroots women in urban and rural areas. The organization conducts studies on its own, collaborates with outside researchers, works with grassroots women's groups to assist with projects, and does advocacy work around issues of women's rights as human rights, women's health and reproductive rights, and ecological issues of particular importance to women. It also runs a media monitoring project, which has recently published its findings in *Pravda Vostoka*.

The Center is currently collaborating with Rome University and Bilston College in the United Kingdom in a research project on the status of women in rural areas. This research will take place in the Ferghana District, the Tashkent District, and the Kashkadaria District. Researchers from the Women's Resource Center will conduct the research in collaboration with Eduoardo Burlini, Marta Bruno, and E. Fadeeva.

The center's chairperson, Marfua Tokhtakhodjaeva, has been trained in gender-sensitive research methods in Rome and is familiar with the Socioeconomic and Gender Analysis Programme research tools developed by the FAO WID Service that were discussed in the preceding section. She has published two books on Uzbek women, *Between the Slogans of Communism and the Laws of Islam*, Lahore: Shirkat Gah, 1995, and *The Daughters of Amazons: Voices from Central Asia*, Lahore: Shirkat Gah, 1996. These publications are not currently sold in Uzbekistan (although there are copies at the UNDP office), but can be ordered from Shirkat Gah, 208 Scotch Corner, Upper Mall, Lahore, Pakistan (email: sgah@shah.brain.net.pk). Another member of the Center, Barno Valiva, a specialist in Islamic law is has recently finished a study on Women, Society and Law, which will be published in Uzbek.

The center has completed a study of the status of women in the textile and pharmaceutical industries with the United Nations University in Helsinki. It has also conducted studies on Women and Criminal Law, funded by the Eurasia foundation, and on Women in Mahallah, funded by the Counterpart Consortium. The findings of these studies (particularly that on women in the textile industry) may have insights about the conditions of non-agricultural employment for rural women that could be relevant to the BASIS research.

Business Women's Association of Uzbekistan (Tadbirkor Ayol)

41 Afrosiab St.

Tashkent 700015

Uzbekistan

Telephone: (7-3712) 565147, 566578

Fax: 567328, 568158

Director: Tadzgikhon Saiidikramova

Chairperson: Dildora M. Alimbekova

Chairperson, Kokand Branch: Sakhiba Ergaiova (spelling may be different)

Chairperson, Tashkent Region: Makhmudova Gulnora (tel. 586890, 796393)

An independent, self-financed NGO founded in 1991, the Business Women's Association has about 200 affiliated organizations in 10 regions. Many of the affiliates are government financed. The BSA conducts training courses for women in the areas of business planning, bookkeeping, accounting, computer skills, and the organization of credit unions. It is currently working closely

with Mercy Corps and Winrock International on a government requested proposal to establish a legal framework for savings and credit unions. The BWA has received grants from USAID, Counterpart Corporation, Mercy Corps, Eurasia Fund, the Global Fund for Women and many German organizations.

Although BWA is most active in urban areas and works mainly with middle class women, it also works with rural women. In the Ferghana Valley, it has active branches in Namangan, Andijan, and Kokand. The chairperson of the Kokand branch, Sakhiba Ergaiova (spelling may be incorrect) is well known for her commitment and effectiveness.

Diamond Association (Assosiatsia Diamonde), Kyrgyz Republic

164-15 Chuiski Prospect

Bishkek 720001

The Kyrgyz Republic

Telephone/fax: (7-3312) 226384, 225484

email: root@kprc.bishkek.su

President: B. Tugelbaeva

Vice President: A. Tabishalieva

Secretary: D. Shukurova

The Diamond Association in the Kyrgyz Republic is similar to the Women's Resource Center in Uzbekistan in that it was founded by a group of university women (in 1994) as an independent NGO to study the participation of women in the economic, social and political life of post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan. It is focused on seeking solutions to women's economic problems.

Like the Women's Resource Center, the Diamond Association may have members with research skills and interests that could help assure that the BASIS research in the Ferghana Valley is sensitive to the issues of major importance to women. Some might be available to participate on the research teams.

3. UZBEK WOMEN WITH BASIS RELEVANT SKILLS WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL NGOS

Winrock International

98 Uzbekistan Ave.

Tashkent 700000

Uzbekistan

Telephone: (7-3712) 455961 Tel/Fax: 459265

email: win@win.tashkent.su

Inobat Avezmuratova is trained in women's advocacy and in gender-sensitive research and community organization methods that include many of the tools used in rapid and participatory rural appraisal. She has fluent in English as well as Russian and Uzbek. She is a former teacher, currently employed as Winrock's office manager.

Mercy Corps

56-A, building 7

C-14, Tashkent

Uzbekistan

Telephone: (7-3712) 1440896, 1442268, 1442368 fax: 1440996

email for L. Mameva: lena@mci.silk.org

Lena Mamaeva, currently employed as Assistant to the Director at Mercy Corp, has recently had three months of training in the United States on the organization and operation of SCAs and in computer programs relevant to SCAs. She has trained women in SCA organization and management and is fluent in English, Russian and Uzbek.

4. UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS WITH BASIS-RELEVANT RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

UNDP Uzbekistan

4 Taras Shevchenko St.

Tashkent 700029

Uzbekistan

Tel: (7-3712) 560606 Fax: 406291

email for D. Abdurazakova: dona@fouzb.undp.org

The UNDP Programme in Uzbekistan is an important resource for sharing information about BASIS research plans and progress, for potential collaboration and funding, and for making contact with other researchers doing studies on women.

Dona Abdurazakova is a UNDP national program officer and the gender focal point. Her office has information on several researchers working on women's issues, including two who are being sponsored by UNDP: Dr. Deniz Kandiyoti of SOAS at the University of London and Ms. Meryem Aslan, a former UN volunteer who worked with rural women in Karakalpakstan (see below for more info).

The BASIS research team should also contact the UNDP gender focal point in Kyrgyzstan.

Women in Development Service**Food and Agriculture Organization**

Viale delle Terme de Caracalla

00100 Rome, Italy

Telephone: (39-6) 5225-5102

Fax: (39-6) 5225-2004

email: SEAGA@fao.org

The Socioeconomic and Gender Analysis Programme of the Women in Development Service at FAO-Rome is currently developing a set of handbooks containing materials for conducting participatory socioeconomic and gender analysis in rural areas. These materials contain many useful field research tools. They include institutional analysis and macro-economic issue analysis tools relevant to policymaking. I highly recommend these materials to the BASIS research team.

They would provide an excellent basis for training in gender and socioeconomic difference sensitive rapid rural appraisal research methods.

Currently there are five handbooks available:

- SEAGA Framework and Users Reference
- SEAGA Macro Level Handbook
- SEAGA Intermediate Level Handbook (institutional analysis)
- SEAGA Field Level Handbook (the most important single volume for BASIS)
- SEAGA Sector Guide: Irrigation

5. EXPATRIATE SCHOLARS DOING RESEARCH ON UZBEK AND KYRGYZ RURAL WOMEN

The researchers working with the Women's Research Center research project on rural women are:

- Edoardo Burlini Rome University (email: e.burlini@mclink.it)
- E. Fadeeva Bilston College, UK (email: E.Fadeeva@bilston.ac.uk)
- Marta Bruno Bilston College, UK (email: sbruno@caspar.it)
- Professor Deniz Kandiyoti from the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London will be conducting a study in Andijan District, apparently with research support from UNDP. (email: DK1@soas.ac.uk)
- Meryem Alsan will conduct a study on rural women in Karakalpakstan. Ms. Alsan was a UN volunteer who spent one year in the Aral Sea area (email: MeryemAslan@novib.nl).
- Elizabeth Constantine Central Asian Program, Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Iowa. Telephone: (319) 335-35584 (email: elizabeth-constantine@uiowa.edu).

Elizabeth Constantine conducted Ph.D. dissertation research in the Andijan District in the village of Oiim near the border with Osh Region She used her knowledge of the Uzbek language to interview 100 rural women, focusing on the values that orient their economic and social lives and the extent to which Soviet values have been accepted and assimilated. Constantine's dissertation for the Department of Central Eurasian Issues at Indiana University is provisionally titled: *Uzbek Women Under Soviet Rule: Public Discourse and Private Lives*. She would be interested in hearing more about the BASIS research. She informed me that there are also two historians working on women's history in Uzbekistan: Doug Northrup wrote a Ph.D. dissertation for Stanford University on the campaign during the 1930s and 1940s to unveil women. Meryann Camp of Whitman College conducted research on Uzbek women of the 1920s.

- John Schoeberline Engel at the Central Asia Forum, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, has been collecting information on Ph.D. dissertations dealing with Central Asia at Harvard and other universities. He is compiling a list of scholars working on Central Asia. His telephone number is (617) 495-4338.

REFERENCES

- Bloch, Peter C., James M. Delehanty, and Michael J. Roth, editors. 1996. *Land and Agrarian Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic*. LTC Research Paper 128. Madison: Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Brainerd, Elizabeth. *Winners and Losers in Russia's Economic Transition*. 1995. Manuscript, Harvard University Department of Economics.
- Chemonics International, et al. 1997. *Uzbekistan: Farm Restructuring and Development Program Feasibility Study*. Washington, DC..
- Delehanty, James, and Katie Rasmussen. 1996. "Agrarian Structure." In *Land and Agrarian Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic*, edited by Peter C. Bloch, James M. Delehanty, and Michael J. Roth, pp. 43-62. LTC Research Paper 128. Madison: Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Eckert, Julia, and Georg Elwert. 1996. *Land Tenure in Uzbekistan*. Report for GTZ Sector Project: Relevance of Land Tenure Development for Developing Countries.
- Herman, Robert, Cate Johnson, and Valerie Estes. 1996. *Gender Considerations in the Central Asian Republics: A Preliminary Assessment*. Draft report prepared for USAID/CAR.
- Kuehnast, Kathleen. 1993. *A Beneficiary Assessment: Women and Economic Changes in Kyrgyzstan, Coping Mechanisms and Attitudes Towards Social Policies*. World Bank.
- Kyrgyz Republic, National Statistical Committee. 1996. *Women of the Kyrgyz Republic, Statistical Book*. Bishkek.
- Lestina, Robert, and Charles Voytan. 1996. *Determining the Feasibility of Credit Union Formation for Members of the Private Farmers Association, Fergana Oblast, Uzbekistan*. Completion of Assignment Report, Winrock International, Tashkent.
- Mearns, Robin. 1996. *Commons and Collectives: The Lack of Social Capital in Central Asia's Land Reforms*. Working Paper. Institute of Development Studies.
- Nagarajan, Geetha. 1997. *Rural Financial Markets in Uzbekistan: A Note*. Draft. Ohio State University.
- Roth, Michael, Katie Rasmussen, Erika Nystrom, and James Delehanty. 1996. "Dimensions of Farm Restructuring in the Kyrgyz Republic: Assessment of Farm-Level Processes and Constraints." In *Land and Agrarian Reform in the Kyrgyz Republic*, edited by Peter C. Bloch, James M. Delehanty, and Michael J. Roth, pp. 81-126. LTC Research Paper 128. Madison: Land Tenure Center, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- State Committee on Forecasting and Statistics of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan. 1996. *Uzbekistan-Business Partner*. Tashkent: SHARC.
- UNICEF. 1994. *Women and Gender in Countries in Transition: A UNICEF Perspective*. Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States and Baltic States.
- . 1997. *Signs of Hope: Current Issues in Child Rights in the Central Asian Republics*.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 1997. *Population Migration in Uzbekistan (1989-1996)* Tashkent.

US Department of State. 1997a. *Uzbekistan Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996*. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

_____. 1997b. *Kyrgyz Republic Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1996*. Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

Uzbekistan. 1996. *Economy of the State of Uzbekistan 1991-1995*. State Committee for Forecasting and Statistics of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Tashkent.

World Council of Credit Unions, Inc. N.d. *Creating Savings and Credit Associations to Serve Microentrepreneurs in Uzbekistan: A Pilot Project*. Draft.

ANNEX: TABLES FOR STAGE I RESEARCH

All data should be presented for 1991 and 1996 (1997 if possible) for Uzbekistan total and Andijan region, and for Kyrgyzstan total and Osh region.

1. LAND

1. Total land area, and principal uses: agricultural (total, arable, irrigated, pastures), industrial/commercial, residential, forest, other.
2. Agricultural land by quality (bonitet?).
3. Agricultural land by different types of tenure: state, corporation, lease, rent, dekhkan, private freehold.
4. Number and area of household and subsidiary plots on sovkhov/kolkhoz/corporation.
5. Land rent payments per hectare on land of different quality and location.
6. Land tax rates per hectare on land of different quality and location.
7. Number of land titles (by type: state acts, other certificates) issued for each year from 1991-1997 for agricultural land, other land, and total number existing at the end of each year.
8. Number of land titles registered in state registration organs for each year 1991-1997 for agricultural land and other land.
9. Number of land share certificates issued for each year 1991-1997 and total number existing at the end of each year.
10. Area of agricultural land surveyed and mapped by state agencies for each year 1991-1997.
11. Number of land plots (or titles) taken back by government or agricultural enterprises by cause (non-use, misuse, other).

2. LABOR AND INCOME DATA

1. Population by age (under 16, 16-35, 36-55, 55-60, 60 and older) and sex.
2. Population growth rates (including birth rate, death rate, and migration rate) for rural and urban population of oblasts and countries.
3. Share of population officially employed, using same age and sex categories.
4. Rural population as percent of total, by age and sex.
5. Average family size by rural versus urban.
6. Population density per square km.
7. Population by hectare of arable and of irrigated land.
8. Employment by sector (e.g., agriculture, industry, construction) by age and sex.

9. Employment by occupational category (e.g., unskilled manual, skilled manual, clerical, professional) by sex and age.
10. Legal minimum and average wages and salaries by sector and by sex.
11. Legal minimum and average wages and salaries by occupational category and by sex.
12. Estimates of surplus labor by sector and by sex and age (to the extent possible).
13. Distribution of household income by income class, i.e., by quintals (if possible in dollars at official exchange rate for comparability between years and countries).
14. Sources of household income (monetary and non-monetary shares, wages, enterprise and self-employment, pensions and transfers, revenue from private plots) by occupational category (collective farm workers, entrepreneurs, industrial workers, managers, pensioners).
15. Migration from rural areas to urban centers (within raion, within oblast, within country, international) by age and sex.

3. WATER

1. Water sources: number of cubic meters of water available for use by source (rivers, reservoirs, groundwater, etc., including amount requiring pumping and amount delivered by sprinklers and drip).
2. Water uses: number of cubic meters used for agriculture, industry, domestic, etc.
3. Water use in agriculture: number of cubic meters used per hectare by crop (cotton, grain, corn, alfalfa, vegetables, fruits, etc.).
4. Costs of water delivery: sums/soms per cubic meter spent by different levels of government and for different delivery types, by type of expenditure.
5. Charges for water paid by different types of users.
6. Annual rainfall and distribution by month.
7. Evapo-transpiration rates for different crops.
8. Number and type of institutions managing water (state organs, agricultural enterprises, water users' associations, etc.), and volumes (cu. m.) managed by each type.
9. Length of irrigation canals by type (primary, secondary, tertiary, and lined/unlined).
10. Costs per meter of annual maintenance of irrigation canals by type (primary, secondary, tertiary, and lined/unlined).

4. MECHANIZATION

1. Available agricultural machines by type (tractor, combine/picker, etc.) and size (horsepower or rows).
2. Average age of machines.

3. Annual expenditures for acquisition of machines.
4. Annual expenditures for maintenance of machines.
5. Annual operating expenditures (fuel, lubricants, etc.) of machines.
6. Distribution of ownership of agricultural machines by state, MTPs, agricultural enterprises (by legal type), service cooperatives, and individuals.

5. FINANCE

(Data is to be collected at national and oblast levels: Andijan and Osh.)

1. Macro-economic information for each year 1991-1997: inflation rates or consumer price index and foreign exchange rate (sum/dollar).
2. For each bank, consolidated financial statements for fiscal years ending 1991-1997: assets/liabilities, income/expense statements, cash flow reports, delinquency reports (30 days, 90 days, 1 year).
3. For each bank record the following data for fiscal years 1991-1997: for each savings instrument, the type, interest rate, term, minimum amount, restrictions on withdrawals, and volume (in sum); for each credit instrument, the type of loan, interest rate, term, information required by banks on the loan application, volume (in sum) and delinquency (past due amounts); the number of savers and the number of borrowers.
4. Aggregate information for all banks (1991-1997): number of savers, number of borrowers, total savings, total loans, total reserves, total assets.
5. Other information: delayed payment for inter-enterprise debt; data on Business Development Funds and Central Asian-American Enterprise Funds (fund size, loan distribution by type of loan and/or by agricultural/non-agriculture, term, interest rate, total loans granted, current loans outstanding, repayment rate); government agricultural subsidies budget (credit and non-credit); insurance companies (amount of claims for bad loans).

6. RESTRUCTURING

1. Number of agricultural enterprises by legal type (for each year, 1991-1997).
2. Number of new agricultural enterprises created by legal type (for each year).
3. Number of agricultural enterprises dissolved/restructured by legal type (for each year).
4. Area of arable and irrigated land held by agricultural enterprises of types.

(Note: Collect annual data from 1991 to 1997 on the following questions):

5. Average number of workers or shareholders of agricultural enterprises (breakdown by sex if possible).
6. Average number of agricultural machines owned by agricultural enterprises.
7. Debts of agricultural enterprises by legal type.

8. Production of principal crops (cotton, grain, corn, alfalfa, etc.) of agricultural enterprises by legal type.
9. Annual labor requirements (person days) per hectare of crops.
10. Purchase of fertilizers, agricultural chemicals, etc. by agricultural enterprises by legal type.
11. Gross revenue per hectare of production of different crops by farm type.
12. Net revenue per hectare of production of different crops by farm type.
13. Crop insurance payments paid to agricultural enterprises, by type of enterprise and reason for payment.
14. Status of the provision of social services (schools, kindergartens, canteens, health clinics, etc.) by type of provider (state, raion, municipality, farm enterprise, private, other, none).